

as"
oo.
al-
test
the
s in
han-
ed to
analy-
es a
be-
s of
tion

full-
CAN-
D.
her.
kes-
A lit-
optic
the
Na-
ORE.
arks,
quare

tion-
tten-
sam-

ork.

THE CHURCH REVIEW

VOL. L.—NOVEMBER, 1887.—No. CLXXVIII.

BOSWELL'S LIFE OF JOHNSON.

Boswell's Life of Johnson: Including Boswell's Journal of a Trip to the Hebrides and Johnson's Diary of a Journey into South Wales. Edited by GEORGE BUKBECK HILL, D. C. L., Pembroke College, Oxford. In six volumes. Oxford, at the Clarendon Press. New York: Macmillan & Co.

In the ninety-six years which have elapsed since the Scottish Laird, James Boswell, printed his *Life of Dr. Samuel Johnson*, Dr. Samuel Johnson has faded as an authority about anything slowly and silently away. His *Dictionary* has been a hundred times superseded. His moral essays are dead and forgotten, his poetry unrecorded, his biographical and histriographical labors defunct, and the mass of his Prefaces, Lectures, Discourses, and Dissertations lost in the dust of generations. To the fourth generation (who, however, will yet turn these pages with delighted avidity), the Boswell masterpiece, then, is only a Table Talk. But none the less it towers still as an immortal contribution to English Literature, well worthy of the six ornate octavos, splendid in all the typographical glory which the Clarendon Press has lavished upon them—in which it lies before us. It becomes us, perhaps, therefore, to inquire, in reviewing the last of its numberless editions, to seek if we can define the quantum of immortality which has brought it to our hands.

To begin with, James Boswell must be given his due share of applause. Let us do justice to Boswell. To all these generations a "Boswell" has been a byword. "A Boswell" was a very little man who chronicled the small beer of a very big man: a sort of literary flunkie who entered kicks, cuffs, and

good advice in his note-book with entire impartiality, with all the more *gusto* in that they were entirely at his own expense. But on overhauling the record, James Boswell himself does not seem to have quite entitled himself to the definition (however, in lazy acquiescence, it may have been accepted). He seems to have admitted very frankly and very plainly at the outset what he is going to do, and why he thinks it worth doing, without in the least deprecating any adverse renown to be achieved in the doing.

I am fully aware of the objections which may be made to the minuteness on some occasions of my detail of Johnson's conversation, and how happily it is adapted for the petty exercise of ridicule, by men of superficial understanding and ludicrous fancy. But I remain firm and confident in my opinion that minute particulars are frequently characteristic and always amusing when they relate to a distinguished man. [I. p. 33.]

Nor was Boswell, Scotsman though born, entirely insensible to the joke not trepanned upon him. Let the following suffice:

My worthy booksellers and friends, Messieurs Dilly in the Poultry, at whose hospitable and well covered table I have seen a greater number of literary men than at any other except that of Sir Joshua Reynolds, had invited me to meet Mr. John Wilkes and some more gentlemen on Wednesday, May 15th.—‘Pray (said I) let us have Dr. Johnson.’—‘What! with Mr. Wilkes? not for the world (said Mr. Edward Dilly); Dr. Johnson would never forgive me.’—‘Come (said I), if you'll let me negociate for you, I will be answerable that all shall go well.’ DILLY. Nay, if you will take it upon you, I am sure I shall be very happy to see them both here.

Notwithstanding the high veneration which I entertained for Dr. Johnson, I was sensible that he was sometimes a little actuated by the spirit of contradiction, and by means of that I hoped I should gain my point. I was persuaded that if I had come upon him with a direct proposal, ‘Sir, will you dine in company with Jack Wilkes?’ he would have flown into a passion and would probably have answered, ‘Dine with Jack Wilkes, Sir! I'd as soon dine with Jack Ketch.’ I therefore, while we were sitting quietly by ourselves at his house in an evening, took occasion to open my plan thus: ‘Mr. Dilly, sir, sends his respectful compliments to you and would be happy if you would do him the honor to dine with him on Wednesday next, along with me, as I must soon go to Scotland.—JOHNSON. Sir, I am obliged to Mr. Dilly. I will wait upon him.—BOSWELL. Provided, sir, I suppose, that the company which he is to have is agreeable to you.

JOHNSON. What do you mean sir? What do you take me for? Do you think I am so ignorant of the world as to imagine that I am to prescribe to a gentleman what company he is to have at his table? BOSWELL. I beg your pardon, sir, for wishing to prevent you from meeting people whom you might not like. Perhaps he may have some of what he calls his patriotick friends with him.—JOHNSON. Well, sir, and what then? What care *I* for his *patriotick friends*? Poh!—BOSWELL. I should not be surprised to find Jack Wilkes there.—JOHNSON. And if Jack Wilkes should be there, what is that to *me*, sir? My dear friend, let us have no more of this. I am sorry to be angry with you. But really it is treating me strangely to talk to me as if I could not meet any company whatever occasionally.—BOSWELL. Pray, forgive me, sir. I meant well. But you shall meet whoever comes, for me.—Thus I secured him and told Dilly that he would find him very well pleased to be one of his guests on the day appointed. [III. p. 65.]

To say that this piece of stratagem were worthy of Talleyrand would be to compliment the Frenchman! We cannot, therefore, entirely concede to James Boswell that lackey flavor which has for so many years hung on an adjective quarried out of his name.

But nevertheless, however deftly done, what Boswell did for Johnson would have very speedily perished, had not its object been grand enough to perpetuate it. After all, it is Johnson's rugged, ponderous, honest personality which keeps himself and his biographer before us in the flesh. Big, clumsy, disfigured, bloated—not always with laundried linen, but still magnificent and awful—here at the end of almost a century of years.

It is the man, then, Samuel Johnson, and not the author, who so stands before us, confronts us, and will not merge himself in any other personality; who, with whomsoever he moves—with the King, with Chesterfield, with Garrick, Goldsmith, Reynolds—always and everywhere, is first. As an English poet, author, lexicographer, Samuel Johnson is as dead as Cæsar. Nobody would think of reading his *Vanity of Human Wishes*—which Pope (doubtless because it conveyed the sincere flattery of imitation in it) said would cause its obscure writer to be speedily *deterré*. Nobody turns the pages of the *Lives of the Poets*; it would probably acquit of murder in the first degree on the ground of insanity could a prisoner be proved to have read *Rasselas*; the dictionary is obsolete and unopened (save as a curiosity), and yet Samuel Johnson all but closes the perspective as

we peer backward toward the horizon in the history of English Literature. It is at least instructive to the student of men and manners to speculate as to the wherefore of such a phenomenon, to seek if so be he can account for the chronicle of the doings and sayings of the latter years of the life of any one man (written down in the heat of memory, for the sake of what the man himself had done, or was supposed to have done for his own date and for a posterity happily assumed) entirely outliving the works of that man, and the achievements to which he himself fondly looked for immortality. Why we should ignore a long life of preface writing, dictionary making, platitude framing, verse composing, biography collecting, and yet be unable to erase from our mental vision the figure of a fat unkempt old man in a cocked hat, rolling along Fleet Street, and uttering the ponderous commonplace —

Why, sir, Fleet Street has a very animated appearance ; but I think the full tide of human experience is at Charing Cross !

In the name of the Prophet, Figs ! And in the name of the Prophet, Why ? Let us attempt our answer by process of exclusion. In the first place, the WHY is not in the moral quality of the great Doctor's table talk. It is cheering to ordinary mortals to find that he was no more infallible than the rest of us. His sententiousness (save in one or two such cases as "Hell is paved with good intentions," "the highest compliment a man can pay the memory of his first wife is to marry a second") is as often erroneous as exact. His literary judgment (in so far as there is any canon in things literary) was oftener wrong than right. He admired and toaded to Richardson, would hear nothing but adulation of Pope, and patronised Shakespeare with a lofty atmosphere of approval on the whole, which is only laughed at to-day. He wrote long argumentative abstractions by way of briefs for Boswell's law cases ; and Boswell, in every instance in which he used them, was beaten out of court, horse, foot, and dragoons. (The great Doctor recouped himself, however, by claiming that a lawyer was never beaten simply by an adverse decision of the court, going much farther in latitude than lawyers of the present day in claiming that one may advocate any case, good or evil, on the rather extra-casuistical ground that the lawyer does not know whether he is wrong or right until the court decides the cause!) Indeed, it may be doubted whether the table talk of any man of affairs (from Coleridge to Silas

Lapham) would not yield an equal amount of shrewd sententiousness, ready wit and skill in making the worse appear the better reason. Clearly the greatness of Dr. Johnson is not to be looked for in the *matter* with which he dealt.

There being nothing left, then, we are obliged to award his greatness to his manner. And his manner seems to have consisted principally in a Latinity of speech. Dr. Johnson's date was the date of the artificial and the hybrid in English speech. The pithy diction of Elizabethan times—the pregnant and pungent diction of Shakespeare and his predecessor Marlowe—the almost phonographic style of Bacon—disappeared with the Puritan surge that swept over England just as William Shakespeare laid down his pen forever. When the Fanatic overran the provinces and set up his state in the capitals, bestrewing his cant plentifully in the vernacular, the stately and sonorous diction which had come in with the Renaissance was lost in the *mélange*. Milton aside (a phenomenon for the time being almost as great as was Shakespeare permanently), the tune of the time was nasal, irreverent, and so temporary that, except by a search warrant, we can scarcely find a specimen of it to-day. In the paralysis, Dryden alone preserved by main strength the rugged honesty of English, but he did it at a sacrifice of its purity, escaping only the cant of his times by a license which, even for the laxest of euphuists, almost turns the stomach of our taste. We have forgiven him for rewriting Shakespeare in partnership with so feeble a pen as that of the putative godson of the greatest of Englishmen, since it was to that rewriting that his age owed even the bungling editions which kept that greatest of Englishmen before his countrymen. But it can hardly be forgiven even to Dryden, that he believed his own selection of every opportunity in the great text for obscene amplification necessary to his own eminence. Addison, dull as he was as he sat placidly twirling his thumbs, like a literary Casby, is, with his imitators, about the only episode to be chronicled from Shakespeare to Johnson in the record of romantic English; and Pope, with Dryden for an evident and constant model, had just filled the ear of England with cadences whose architecture was so perfect as to entirely conceal the borrowed material of which his verses were built.

It was natural that Johnson was saturated, as was his age, with the metallic excellence of Pope. It was doubtless equally

inevitable that, in casting about for a prose style, he selected Addison's, and that, however he mortised the two, and dwelt lovingly on Dryden, he should have set his face like a flint, and guarded his pen, lest by any hap or hazard, the weird beauty of Elizabethan romance, the magnet of Shakespeare or the glamour of his magic, should in any way veer it from its polished and glossy periods. Dryden had translated Virgil with a nice ear for English which had entirely misconstrued the Latin poet to Englishmen. It was Dryden's, not Virgil's *Aeneid* which Englishmen read, just as later on Pope's, not Homer's *Iliad* was to give them their idea of Greek. The one great quality which alone we think was Johnson's own, the one single flavor which Johnson brought into the English language (unless Ben Jonson brought it there,—but if he did, it had returned again), was the Latinity which by a sort of natural selection, he absorbed from his earliest books, and welded into the fibre of every word he spoke unto his dying day.

Mr. Langton one day asked Dr. Johnson how he had acquired so accurate a knowledge of Latin, in which, I believe, he was exceeded by no man of his time: he said, ‘My master whipt me very well. Without that, sir, I should have done nothing.’ [I. p. 46.]

Indeed, the rod has always, in the curriculum of an English school, borne the biggest part. Shakespeare took occasion often in his plays to speak of the terror with which pedagogues inspired their pupils; and Peacham, writing of the schoolmasters of about that day, said, “Whereas they make one scholar they mar ten;” and, farther on, describes one who used to flog his boys on cold winter mornings for no other purpose than to get himself into a heat. In the volume before us Dr. Johnson alludes to the practice as in full force in his day.

Speaking of one of his masters, Mr. Hunter, ‘he used (he said) to beat us unmercifully: and he did not distinguish between ignorance and negligence: for he would beat a boy equally for not knowing a thing as for neglecting to know it. He would ask a boy a question, and if he did not answer it, he would beat him, without considering whether he had an opportunity of knowing how to answer it. For instance, he would call up a boy and ask him the Latin for a candle-stick, which the boy could not expect to be asked. Now, sir, if a boy could answer every question there would be no need of a master to teach him.’

Peter Mason, a student at Eton nearly a hundred years be-

fore, said that under Nicholas Udal, Master of that school, it was no unusual thing for a boy to receive fifty lashes in the course of a single Latin exercise, and that he, himself, had received as high as fifty-three. The late Charles Reade's account of his own schoolboy days, as to the flogging, is even more terrible than this, reading like some modern account of torture by the Russian knout. Sergeant Ballantyne, whose schooling must have been somewhere *circa* 1820-30, says that his teachers were "cold-blooded, unsympathetic tyrants, who flogged continuously and taught nothing in particular." And Anthony Trollope's experiences, as related in his entrancing biography, are directly to the same effect. "My tutor," he says, "had studied the theories of Draco. Hang a little boy for stealing apples, he used to say, and other little boys will not steal apples. . . . The result was, that, as a part of his daily exercise, he thrashed one with a big stick." Very few able-bodied men, one would say in reading this uniform testimony, would be able to endure what has always been and still is (we believe) considered the thing for the youngest English lads. And yet there is something to say for it if, in the case of Dr. Johnson at least, it drove the Roman so completely into the fibre.

Johnson, upon all occasions, expressed his approbation of enforcing instruction by means of the rod. 'I would rather,' said he, 'have the rod to be the general terror to all, to make them learn, than tell a child, "if you do thus or thus, you will be more esteemed than your brothers or sisters." The rod produces an effect which terminates in itself. A child is afraid of being whipped, and gets his task, and there's an end on 't: whereas by exciting emulation and comparisons of superiority you lay the foundation of lasting mischief. You make brothers and sisters hate each other.' [I. p. 46.]

At any rate, by well grounding (or well whipping) in Latin, the great Doctor's style became so ponderous that it seems to have kept literary London in a state of abject terror. As literary men, whatever their trials and calamities, have at least the power of shaping reputations and manufacturing the impressions which the remainder world make oath to, Dr. Johnson's fame was not only of the library and the cloister, but of the court, the coffee-house, and the street. He became one of the sights of London, and it was an honor to have been snubbed by him. His dictionary was as great a terror to the English people of that day as it ever became thereafter to

Becky Sharp's schoolmates, whether they opened it or not. The day of literary despots has passed forever. At this date there could no more be a potentate like Johnson than a kingdom like Dahomey in civilised Europe or America. But at that day no book could live long without the great Doctor's approval sounded like a trumpet in the Latin-English, which abjectly frightened away a possible rejoinder.

It is nothing, perhaps, to be surprised at that when Johnson came to edit Shakespeare he should have brought to the task the same oracular ponderousness as stood him in stead everywhere else. We must remember that for a century or so it had been the fashion to patronise Shakespeare. Shaftesbury had complained of Shakespeare's "rude and unpolished style and antiquated phrase and wit." Rymer had jeered at his knowledge of decency or propriety. Dryden had placed him "below the dullest writers of our own or any precedent age." Voltaire had called him "a drunken savage." Hume had denied to him "a reasonable propriety of thought;" adding, "It is in vain we look in him for either purity or simplicity of diction. Both he and Ben Jonson were equally deficient in taste and elegance in harmony and correctness." Denham had declared that Shakespeare was nothing compared with Cowley. Edward Phillipps, the nephew of Milton (in his *Theatrum Poetarum*), pronounced the bard of Avon "the laughter of the critics;" and John Dennis, who was esteemed alternately the rival and equal of Pope in literary judgment, declared that he "set all propriety at defiance, his lines utterly devoid of celestial fire, his verses harsh, unpolished, unmusical." Thus belabored on all sides, poor Shakespeare, perhaps, had ought to be thankful for Johnson's distant though charitable approval. Still, it reads rather queerly to take down Dr. Johnson's own edition of Shakespeare and absorb his commentaries on the Shakespearian text. Let him turn, for example, to where the Doctor says of *Hamlet*,—

We must allow to the tragedy of *Hamlet* the praise of variety. The incidents are so numerous that the argument of the play would make a long tale. The scenes are interchangeably diversified with merriment and solemnity . . . that includes judicious and instructive observations. . . . New characters appear from time to time in continual succession, exhibiting various forms of life and particular modes of conversation. The pretended madness of Hamlet causes much mirth . . . the catastrophe is not very happily produced; the exchange of

weapons is rather an expedient of necessity than a stroke of art. A scheme might easily be found to kill Hamlet with the dagger and Laertes with the bowl.

Again, of *Julius Cæsar*, —

Of this tragedy, many particular passages deserve regard, and the contention and reconciliation of Brutus and Cassius is universally celebrated. But I have never been strongly agitated in perusing it, and think it somewhat cold and unaffectionate, etc.

Of *Macbeth* the good Doctor loftily approves, but adds, "It has no nice discriminations of character . . . I know not whether it may not be said in some parts which now seem improbable, that in Shakespeare's time it was necessary to warn credulity against vain and illusive predictions." (In which latter sentence we see, for perhaps the first time in criticism, the tendency, which has run to the utmost limits of crazy imbecility, of assigning ethical or pedagogic purposes in the playwright, who, whatever his results, had no thought but to work up paying theatrical matter for Elizabethan audiences.)

Without pausing to inquire whether *Hamlet* was a low-comedy part in Johnson's eyes (we know it was not to David Garrick's), or whether the melancholy prince's "pretended madness" caused "much mirth" to the age, or only to Samuel Johnson — (People now-a-days do not sit and giggle over "the pretended madness of Hamlet") — let us turn to the *Rambler*, of this excellent lexicographer, and read him, patiently, if we can, citing the magnificent lines, —

Come thick night
And pall thee in the dunness smoke of hell ;
That my keen knife see not the wound it makes,
Nor heaven peep through the blanket of the dark
To cry 'hold ! hold !' —

as an example of "poetry debased by mean expressions;" because "dun" is a "low" expression "seldom heard but in the stable"; "knife," "an instrument used by butchers and cooks in the meanest employment;" and asking "who, without some relaxation of his gravity, can hear of the avengers of guilt peeping through the blanket of the dark!" Let the reader look on a little farther, and find this worthy dictionary maker telling off the spondees and dactyls in the dramas (to ascertain if the cæsura was exactly in the middle) on his fingers and

thumbs, and counting the unities up to three, to see if he could approve of what the ages after him were to worship! if, haply, this Shakespeare (although he might have devised a scheme to kill Laertes with the bowl and Hamlet with the dagger, or might have thrown a little more fire into the quarrel with Brutus and Cassius) could be admitted to sit at the feet of Addison, with his sleepy and dreary *Campaign*; or Pope, with his metrical proverbs and icy platitudes. Let him find the old lexicographer admitting, in his gracious condescension, that *The Tempest* "is sufficiently regular"; of *Measure for Measure* that "the unities are sufficiently preserved"; that the *Midsummer Night's Dream* was "well written"; that the style of the *Merchant of Venice* was "easy"; but that in *As You Like It* "an opportunity of exhibiting a moral lesson" is unhappily lost; the *Winter's Tale* entertaining; in *King John* "a pleasing interchange of incidents and characters" (remarking, however, that "the lady's grief is very affecting"); telling us that *Troilus and Cressida* "is one of the most correctly written of Shakespeare's plays"; of *Coriolanus* that it "is one of the most amusing"; that *Antony and Cleopatra* is "low," and "without any art of connection or care of disposition"; dismissing *Cymbeline* with the remark that he does not care "to waste criticism upon unresisting imbecility; upon faults too evident for detection, and too gross for aggravation"; pleased to commend *Romeo and Juliet*, because "the incidents are numerous and important, the catastrophe irresistibly affecting, and the process of action carried on with such probability, at least with such congruity to popular opinions, as tragedy requires"; and while, on the whole, approving of *Othello*, remarking that "had the scene opened in Cyprus, and the preceding incidents been occasionally related, there had been little wanting to a drama of the most exact and scrupulous regularity." And so on everywhere! Let the reader imagine one thus patronising these mighty and deathless monographs to-day! and hold his peace!

But perhaps the strangest of all his dicta anent great Shakespeare is the following, delivered not in print, but ponderously to his biographer:—

He again talked of the passage in Congreve with high commendation, and said, "Shakespeare never has six lines without a fault.

Perhaps you may find seven, but this does not refute my general assertion. If I come to an orchard and say, there's no fruit here, and then comes a poring man who finds two apples and three pears, and tells me, Sir, you are mistaken, I have found both apples and pears, I should laugh at him. [II. p. 96.]

And yet it is necessary to be charitable even of passages like these, remembering, thankfully, that among other inconveniences of the good old times the literary potentate has entirely disappeared.

Possibly many a reader of these pages (which, eliminating all such passages as these about the comparative merits of Congreve and Shakespeare, have yet in them the life that has survived a century of successors) has asked himself if the gentlemen of those days could possibly have been insensible to the comic aspect of all this Johnsonese — this dressing-up of the smallest of small talk in prodigious adjectives and sententious Latinity ; prefixing every remark with a "Sir !" and making every passing of the time of day read like a bull from the Vatican ! We think we have discovered at least one indication that they were aware of its ridiculousness.

A foreign minister of no very high talents, who had been in his company for a considerable time quite overlooked, happened, luckily, to mention that he had read some of his *Rambler* in Italian, and admired it much. This pleased him greatly . . . and finding that this minister gave such a proof of his taste, he was all attention to him, and on the first remark which he made, however simple, exclaimed 'The ambassador says well ! His excellency observes !' and then he expanded and enriched the little that had been said, in so strong a manner that it seemed something of consequence. This was exceedingly entertaining to the company who were present, and many a time after it furnished a pleasant topick and merriment. *The ambassador says well* became a laughable term of applause, when no mighty matter had been expressed. [III. p. 411.]

One would fancy that there must have been many more of such asides as this !

Amusing as it all is (and there is no better or more relaxing reading than a dip, not too long, into the note-book of the Scotch chronicler) there seems no escape from the conclusion that Dr. Johnson looms up behind us as a figure only, clad with the nimbus of his own peculiar times, but as a maker or an

originator like Shakespeare, Dante, Goethe, or Franklin, the object of no human reverence or gratitude. It is curiosity — not unmixed with respect, but still curiosity — with which we look at him, not with thankfulness that he was. He might have never lived, and we would never have missed a statue to fill his niche. His mission was to approve of the past, not to discount or foresee the future. He was a Tory and a Conservative in politics when politics was on the very eve of progress and reform. He was as blind as Homer himself to anything better than the age he lived in, the civilisation in which he moved, and the manners of the town which he thought the highest possible effort in the way of sociological institutions. He believed that the head of the state should be a king whose will or whim should be law, and that it was impious to question the existence of hereditary castes and titles. The institution of classes was divine in his eyes. To those born in a higher class than himself he took off his hat; from those below him he expected the same obeisance. Had the world been filled with such as he it could never have moved an inch onward or forward. Whatever was, was ordained of Heaven in his eyes, and it was impudence to suggest that anything ought to be improved, superseded, or revised. Whatever in the course of time, had passed away, had existed as a model for present imitation, and conscience was an inward affair to be discreetly kept in tune with whatever happened to come along. When he wrote the parliamentary debates for the *Gentleman's Magazine*, he took care "that the Whig dogs should always get the worst of it." He hated the sound of the word "pension," but recognised the finger of Providence when a pension happened his own way. It did not seem exactly appropriate that a gentleman should be hanged, but when Dr. Dodd was hanged he expressed his satisfaction that it was done decorously and neatly. Clearly it is as a chronicle of a defunct civilisation, as a curiosity, as a most entertaining and deathless transcript of a day and a society forever disappeared, that Boswell's life of Johnson is to be kept in our libraries.

The editor of the present edition, Dr. George Birkbeck Hill, has certainly left no labor of the annotator and the student unexhausted. He has not only furnished an Index (which alone fills one of the six octavos) with a running headline like an encyclopædia, but has been at pains to look up, fix, verify, and

translate every foreign quotation which the great man used or alluded to, and to add to every one of his speeches or items a cross reference to any other touching upon a germane item or thought. Such labor is never appreciated unless by other editors, and is its own only reward. But it is doubtful if there ever will be another such edition of the little Scotch laird's book about the English litterateur. The volumes before us are rich in what the old Doctor himself would hardly have distinguished by a less *ora rotundo* than "a plenitude of pictorial embellishment." Among these the scholar will turn at once to the "Round-Robin," which Sir Joshua Reynolds and his friends sent to the literary dictator, and got a snub in return for. And the student of physiognomy will not fail, we think, to discover in the faces of the old man used as frontispieces to these volumes, the kindly impulses which helped Goldsmith out of constant gaols, picked up the fallen woman in Fleet Street and forewent engagements at great tables to dine with poor old Mrs. Williams, however the dogmatical old pundit believed in purple and fine linen for those born to such amenities, and scourges and starvation for the walks in life wherein such things are not uncommon.

APPLETON MORGAN.

SOME LIMITS TO THE POSSIBILITY OF REVELATION.

EVERY diligent student of Church History must be aware of the fact that in every age and by all expositors the views that have been entertained and presented of the truths that are contained in the Holy Scriptures have been modified to a greater or less extent by the philosophical or metaphysical views that have been adopted by the expositor of those truths or have prevailed in the age and community in which he lived. Even its formal creeds, from the Nicene to the Augsburg Confession and the Thirty-Nine Articles, are but what the framers of those formulas understood and supposed to be Divine truths expressed in language,—words and phrases which had to a large extent originated in and been drawn from one system or another of human philosophy. And this fact naturally leads to the conclusion that every important advance in physical science and every change in the fundamental principle of philosophy will create a want for some new expositions and modes of expressing the truths of our Christian faith.

Language, which is the means and instrument of our expositions and expression of the highest and deepest as well as the most common truths, is both the product and the producer of thought. I do not here raise the question of the Divine origin of language,—the doctrine that it is a gift of God to man. I start with merely what is obvious as a matter of ascertained facts, and true on any theory, and is, in our view of the case, all that we know: namely, that one large part of the primitive words that were used by mankind were imitations of a sound which the objects denoted by them had been heard to make. Thus *meu-mieu* was the earliest name for a cat. And in like manner the names of nearly all objects that make noises or sounds were imitations of the noises or sounds they make.

So in like manner the words that denote events represented the events as they appeared to take place. Thus early man

spoke of the Sun as rising in the east, and its light as coming from the Sun. In modern times we have discovered that, whatever the appearance may indicate, it is not the Sun that rises, but the earth that moves, and by its motion brings us into different relations to the Sun. So, too, we say that light is not a thing that comes or can come from the Sun or from anything else. The Sun is light—or rather luminous, and illuminates the earth and the things that are on it, and so makes them visible. But how it does this is a question that our science is not yet quite prepared to answer.

But with every important step in the progress of science, whether physical or metaphysical, there arises an inquiry into some one or another of the statements of Holy Scripture; and not unfrequently some new view, fuller and more comprehensive as well as more accurate, is gained of what was really meant by those old Seers who spoke in times past as they were moved by the HOLY GHOST.

There are, however, some necessary limitations to any revelations that have been made or that can be made to us which it is important to keep in mind. We hear much, not only in this connection, but elsewhere and very commonly, of the imperfection of language, and of our inability, in consequence of that imperfection, to express our views and feelings—our highest views and our deepest feelings—in a manner that is at all adequate to their nature. A defect or inability that pertains thus to the thoughts of man must of course stand in the way of any communication GOD may wish to make to us—must prove a much greater obstacle and hindrance in the one case than the other. And this fact, it seems to me, should not only furnish some important hints and cautions about insisting upon the dogmas that all must hold as inferences from the Bible statements, but it should also make us feel better contented with such practical guidance as we may derive from that Holy Volume, and more patient to await until we shall no longer be obliged to see as through a glass darkly those eternal realities which are now beyond our comprehension. These objects we call the objects of faith and hope and pursuit, until we reach that nearer presence, when, clothed upon with immortality, we shall see as we are seen and know them as we are known.

I. The first limitation to the possibilities of revelation that I shall speak of is derived from, or rather depends upon, the

nature of knowledge itself, or, more strictly speaking, our means of acquiring knowledge.

The nature and means of acquiring knowledge have been a subject of investigation and controversy since the beginning of Greek philosophy, some six hundred years b.c. In this controversy and in these discussions knowledge has been considered as made up of ideas, or at least it has been so considered since the time and speculations of Plato, who brought the word "idea" into general use. These ideas are, for our present purposes, to be considered as of two kinds or classes : (1) simple ideas, which always represent single properties of objects, and are always expressed in language by abstract terms ; (2) complex or compound ideas, which always represent (*a*) objects, real or imaginary, by several properties, or (*b*) classes of objects by properties that are common to all the objects in the class (collective wholes are considered as individuals). In the former case they are expressed by proper nouns, or nouns used in the singular number with some article or pronoun, as this paper, that man, the house I spoke of ; and in the latter case (*c*) they are expressed by common nouns, as man, house, river, etc.

Plato, as is well known, held that all ideas — that is, ideas of both kinds — are innate to the mind, put there by a Divine act before we were born. Aristotle in several places doubts or denies the reality of such ideas ; and the great controversy of the Middle Ages, as between the Realists and the Nominalists, was in regard to the reality of any such ideas, more especially those of the second kind. In the seventeenth century Locke denied professedly that any of our ideas are innate, but in so doing he denied the innateness only of the simple or elementary ideas that constitute the first class named above. He did not deny, but on the contrary he maintained, that all the ideas of the second class are innate, not indeed in the Platonic sense that they are in the mind when we are born, but in the sense that they are born or made in the mind. His theory was, in brief, that all ideas of the second class — that is, all ideas that denote things, whether as individuals or in classes — are made up of ideas of the first class, or the ideas that denote properties, affections, modes, etc. He held that all ideas of this class are derived by the mind from real objects by the actual cognition of them. He held that our means of cognition are two, corresponding to the two worlds of which we have knowledge, — a

world of matter and the world of mind. The one he called "sensation," or, better, sense-perception; and the other is consciousness, or, as Locke at first calls it, "reflection."

Thus, suppose there is an apple on the table before me: my idea of it—that is, my knowledge of it—that is, all the knowledge I have of it as an individual object before me—is derived from the object itself, and by the use of the senses of sight, touch, taste, and smell. And so of any other material object: our idea of it is obtained, in separate elements, by one or another of the several senses by which we cognise it,—sight, hearing, touch, taste, and smell, with something of the general sense of feeling, as its weight, hardness, elasticity, etc. These elements on Locke's theory are all acquired by separate and distinct sense organs, and we combine them in the mind by acts of imagination into the complex ideas of objects as a whole.

So, on the other hand, if I look inward, by an act of reflection, I become conscious of the mental acts of perceiving and of imagining, of remembering, of reasoning, of feeling pain or pleasure, of love or hate, of hope or fear, of deliberation, and of willing and choosing, and of effort or causation in moving my hands and feet to act and walk, or directing my tongue and vocal organs in speech. And in like manner I put these elements of ideas—"the matter" of them, as Locke calls it—together and form complex ideas of a mind or soul, a something in me, though invisible and intangible, that perceives, remembers, imagines, reasons, feels, deliberates, chooses, and puts forth effort, and acts as cause,—a something which I call myself,—which has, so far as I know or can see, none of the properties, ideas of which are derived from material objects by means of the senses—sense-perception.

Now, as we ascribe none of the properties or elementary ideas obtained by sense-perception to the mind or self, so on the other hand we never ascribe any of these mere mental properties, states, or acts,—as perception, emotion, or volition,—of which we obtain the ideas by consciousness alone, to mere inanimate or material objects, we have two totally distinct worlds or classes of objects within the range of our sphere of knowledge.

But our knowledge is limited by experience or observation. We have no knowledge of mind simply and by itself when it is not active, and none except what we get by consciousness and

530 *Some Limits to the Possibility of Revelation.*

reflection upon the acts and states of our own minds as they act and are acted upon by other things. Nor have we any knowledge of material objects except what we have gathered by the sense-perception which they cause by exciting our own sense-organs and the commingling of these two classes to form scientific ideas ; and we always commingle these in all our attempts at science and a scientific knowledge or comprehension of any fact or class of facts.

This doctrine is easily illustrated ; and the illustration is the needed proof in this case. Thus, if any one is blind, he is without all those elements of ideas, or elementary ideas, that come through the eye, the organ of sight. If one is deaf he labors under the same difficulty in regard to the sounds that objects can produce. "He has no idea of sound ;" and so of the rest.

And in regard to the class of spiritual objects it is the same. If one had never perceived an object, he could have no idea of the act of perception, he could not know what the word means. If he had never felt a pain he could have no more of an idea of pain than the blind man has of the colors of the objects that are around him. So, too, if he had never been conscious of the act of willing and of the effort of causing the motion in his hands and feet, by which he acts, moves about, talks, and deports himself like a man, he could have no idea of volition, or question of spontaneity or freedom ; and most probably no thought of cause or causation in nature, and so no question or thought of the First Cause in the universe as its Creator and Moral Governor.

This doctrine of knowledge and of ideas as the elements and parts of knowledge admits of a good illustration from the science of chemistry. The material universe consists of unnumbered and innumerable objects, just like our complex ideas ; but they are all compounded and made up of a few simple elements,—some sixty-four or five, I believe. With these elements in hand the chemist can make any one of those compounds ; but he cannot make any one of the elements, as oxygen, iron, and sulphur, for that would be to create something anew. So with the elements or elementary ideas derived from the two sources—the world of mind by consciousness and the world of matter by sense-perception. We can make ideas of anything, seen or unseen, just to the extent of our imagination or fancy ; that is, our power of combining these elements.

We often combine the two classes in the same idea, as in our idea of an animal, as a dog or a horse ; we have the ideas of form and color, which are sensible properties. But we ascribe to the animal also, and include in our idea of it, perception, reason, memory, love, hate, and such other mental or spiritual properties or acts as we have seen only by consciousness in ourselves and each one in his own self, as we think that they show or manifest in their actions. In the same way we think of purely spiritual beings, angels, demons, and the souls of the departed, as being conscious of remembering, loving, and hating, of purpose, and hope, and fear ; but we do not ascribe to them any of the sensible properties of which we obtain our idea by sensation, — that is, we do not suppose them to have bodies or to be visible to mortal eyes like those we now have.

There are those, indeed, who claim that besides those elementary ideas, thus derived by actual cognition of really observed objects, we have other ideas of purely elementary nature which they prefer to call *a priori* rather than *innate* ideas. But all the examples that have been thus far cited, except one, are complex ideas, and therefore prove nothing to the point ; any more than the fact that one may have a very good idea of the Nile and the Pyramids who has never visited Egypt and seen its wonders. There is no elementary idea in his idea of these things that he has not derived from cognition of some actual object that has fallen under his observation. If he had never had the use of hands or of eyes, he could form no idea of Egypt and the Nile from anything that anybody could say to him about them.

The only exception to this remark, if indeed there is one, is the word and idea of cause, as something distinct from mere antecedence. Cousin argues, and, as I think, unanswerably, that the idea of cause and causation could not have been obtained from anything in the external world, by mere sense-perception, if by causation we mean anything more than mere antecedence. But we may concede, nay we must contend, that we do mean something more than mere antecedence by the word cause. But we accept also Cousin's solution of the origin of the idea. It comes from the act of willing and from the consciousness of effort, that we are conscious of making, nearly every hour of our lives. And so Locke in one place speaks of it. [Essay, B. II. chap. xxi. 1, 4.]

The most recent discussions have, as I think, made it pretty certain that ideas considered as realities in the mind are mere fiction, as Aristotle said in his day, and as Reid and Cousin have maintained in our more recent times. But this is a point of no consequence to our present purpose. For the practical purposes of life it makes no difference whether the Sun rises and moves around the earth, or the earth revolves and brings us constantly into new relations to the Sun; the result is the same for all our practical purposes, though not the same in the study of astronomy, in the one case as in the other.

This fundamental law and condition of knowledge is, as far as I know, and so far as it has yet been shown, without exception and inexorable. The blind, with all their needs and desires, know nothing, and can get no ideas of color, of light, or, in fact, of darkness either. They may know the form of objects, their size, their density, the odors and the taste of objects, and the various sounds they can make, but they have, and can get, no idea or knowledge of their colors—of their appearance to us, that is, how they look, and of their relations as they are distributed in landscapes and platforms around us.

The application is obvious. Every revelation should teach us something we do not know concerning God and the spiritual world. But from the necessities of the case it can speak to us of God only under the guise of man, that is, anthropomorphitically. It may speak of Him as visible to our eyes or imagination, but it must speak of Him as exercising intellectual facilities like our own, and actuated by feelings such as we have; only in both cases, in the mental acts and in the feeling and purposes as well, without our imperfections, limitations, and moral perversity.

And yet there must be properties and attributes of the objects and beings in the spiritual and heavenly world that are unlike anything we see here, and which are as completely beyond our comprehension, as the colors and perspective of the objects around us are to the blind. I will not press to my use here the words of S. Paul, "Eye hath not seen nor ear heard, nor have entered the heart of man" to conceive "the things which God hath prepared for us" [*I Corinthians*, ii. 9], for S. Paul speaks in this connection of a special revelation to him and perhaps a few others in regard to these very things.

But let us take an example. We read of several instances in

which our LORD appeared after His resurrection. He appeared to His disciples standing in their midst, and then vanished out of sight. Was the change in Him or in them? Did He become visible to such eyes as we have, or were their eyes so changed that for the time they could see Him—though a glorified, spiritual, or rather a spiritualised body. And S. Paul says [*II Corinthians*, xii. 4], speaking of what he saw in his vision, that they were things “unspeakable,” such as “it is not *έξον* for men” or “in man” to speak of, but whether not “lawful” or not “possible” is left to the interpreter to determine.

It is one of the misfortunes of my subject that I cannot point to facts and examples for illustration and proof. All I can do in the case is to show that there must be such facts, though I cannot say precisely what they are. And even if I knew them I could not speak of them so that others could understand them, any more than S. Paul could speak of, or utter, the things “which it is not for man to utter.”

It is quite true that we know of the mind and can speak of it as that which is in us, thinks, reasons, feels, and wills, but still when we ask what it is, we can “form no idea of it,” that is, no idea-image, such as we form of material things. So with God in nature; and so with heavenly things. God is like the wind. We see it not. We hear it not. But we see it moving. We hear the branches rattle and the waves roaring, and we know that the wind blows. And just in this sense do we see God in nature, as we see the wind in the shaking trees, the waving grain, the whirling dust, and hear it in the waves, and just as we see the soul of a man in the glance of his eyes, in the tones of his voice, or the gestures of his hands. But yet we do not see this in the sense that we see the tables and chairs around us, nor in the sense that we see our own minds within us, by immediate consciousness.

In relation to all these visible things we are much in the same relation as we should be to the objects around us if we were both blind and without the sense of touch or feeling. We should soon know that there are things around us. We should hear the sounds they make; we should smell the odors they emit; we could be in no doubt of their existence and their proximity to us. But we could “have no idea of them.” We could not so much as have a question of their color, their size, their form, their positions in space, or of their relations to one

another. We could have no question, I say, of these things, because, being blind and without the sense of touch, or any possible means of contact with them, we could have no idea of color, of size, of form, of hardness, or of distance. We might have, and probably should have, ideas of perception, of reasoning, of feeling, and we might, therefore, ask and consider the question whether these objects that emit the odors and cause the sounds could think and feel, question and reason, believe and doubt, like ourselves or not. But the ideas of their form and appearance, such as are now the first to occur to our minds when we hear the name of anything as yet unknown to us, could not possibly occur to minds residing in bodies thus deprived of the senses and means of sight and contact.

Or, again, suppose I am standing on a hill near a calm and placid lake, there is a vapor arising from its surface, though I cannot see it; it is invisible. But I look up a few hundred feet above the surface of the water—the rising vapor is condensed into a visible cloud, the cloud passes along with the wind, and finally disappears again in invisible vapor or moisture. Now it is conceivable and possible that the invisible things of the spiritual world may become visible as the vapor does by change of constitution in themselves, or, what is more likely, as I think, our eyes may be changed. We ourselves may be so changed that the invisible things of God and heaven may be as manifest, seem as real, as solid as the rocks and mountains now do—a revelation to us, not unlike what would occur to the blind man if sight were to be given him, or to the deaf man if his ears should be so opened that he could hear the sounds and noises that are now so familiar to us.

It forms no part of my present purpose to prove that there is such a spiritual world with its manifold objects, but rather to show that if there is such a world no revelation can be made of it that will make it as clear and as familiar to us, or as well understood by us, as the objects of this material world by which we are surrounded. God cannot be seen. We must think of Him after an anthropomorphic manner, and as a man, wiser and better than any man we ever saw—man without man's wickedness or weakness—man, only infinite in goodness, wisdom, and power. So of heaven and hell. We can form no idea of them that is at all adequate from any revelation or description of them that has been or that could be made to us, any more

than the blind man can have of the objects that are really around, though invisible to him.

Now the practical caution is (1) that we do not ask too much of revelation, do not allow ourselves to be too curious about such objects, or expect such definite information, such clear ideas of them, as we all should be glad to have, and as we can and do have of material things; and (2) to regard all that revelation does say upon such subjects as more or less figurative. Of course we all consider S. John's description of the New Jerusalem, the new heaven and the new earth, as well as the descriptions of the sufferings of the lost in hell, as but figurative language. Divested of figure and taken literally, about all there is left in the assertion is, that hell is painful beyond experience and expression, and that heaven is glorious and desirable beyond conception and imagination. So of the intermediate state, and our friends in that state. What is said of all these objects is not so much with a view to make us understand them, as to excite in us the feelings, the hopes, and the fears that are best calculated to guide and lead us into the way we should go to avoid the one and gain admission to and final blessedness in the other.

When our Holy Scriptures were written, the prevalent opinion was that the earth stood still on a solid foundation; that there is a place somewhere beneath its surface where there is an "intermediate state," and a place of final punishment; that above it—above the visible heavens and the stars, there was a place which is specially the heaven and home of God, as well as the abode of the angels who have not fallen from their first estate. It was supposed that God had a throne there, which, as well as Himself, was visible to such eyes as we now have—or would be so if we could only get near enough—within seeing distance. But modern science has rendered this view no longer tenable. No one supposes that a place of final punishment is in the bowels of the earth. And the telescope has shown that there is no "above" to the heavens. There may be room and place enough beyond the stars for such a heaven as the old believers conceived of. But nobody, as I think, supposes now, in this nineteenth century, that heaven is there, and that God is nearer there than He is here.

And this is not a mere trivial matter, it has its bearing on several very interesting, if not important questions. It runs deep, in fact, into the very foundation of our Christian faith.

(1.) We read of our LORD that, while the disciples beheld, "He was taken up, and a cloud carried Him out of sight." This is intelligible. But we also read that He ascended "into heaven" and that He is there "on the right hand of God." Naturally enough we ask, in view of the discoveries of modern science, what these assertions mean. Literal statements of fact they cannot be. But they are surely suggestive of a most important doctrine. What is it? Can we understand it? Or is it something of a purely spiritual nature, to which we are as blind as those that have no eyes are to the colors of the rainbow, the brilliancy of the stars, or the beauties of an autumn landscape? Of course we cannot doubt that God can even now give to chosen servants a vision of these realities; such as we shall see them after "this mortal shall have put on immortality." Nor do I doubt that such visions have been granted to men. I think S. Paul had one. But most of us must be content to wait and to follow on, in hope, walking by faith when we cannot have sight.

(2.) I cite but one more illustration: From the earliest speculations concerning the nature of the Holy Eucharist, there have been a great variety of views and theories in regard to the "presence" which seems to be implied and promised in various ways and by different forms of expression in the Holy Scriptures. But is not the presence after a spiritual manner? Consider for a moment. CHRIST was God and man: as man, He had a human, visible body; but as God He had the invisible Divine attributes or nature, the Divine substance as well as attributes, while He lived on earth. But at, or after His resurrection, the body was so changed that it might be, and actually became, either visible or invisible as occasion might require, or as our LORD Himself might wish to have it appear. And at the ascension, His body was visible until it went out of sight — or went up until "a cloud received Him out of the sight" — of the multitude that were standing around, beholding that incomprehensible event. This we can understand. "He was taken up," and "a cloud received Him out of their sight." But what then? Doubtless then, as before, the two "natures" were united in one person in the form that was visible as it went up, and until it entered the cloud "out of their sight." Are they not united now? What is the manner of their existence, the mode of their presence, whether in the Holy Eucharist or elsewhere? It

cannot be material. Is it not to us as colors to the blind, sound to the deaf, odors to those who are without the sense of smell? Is it not, over and above the fact that no revelation has been made on these points, also the fact that none can be made to us mortals while we are in the flesh, and with such organs and faculties as we now have? Our organs and means of acquiring the elements of knowledge—the matter of our ideas—are adapted to this world and this life. They give us knowledge of the things that are here and now present in the world around us and the souls within us. But for those things that are above and before us, the things that are unseen and eternal, they are invisible because they are eternal. We must walk by faith, and be content to walk by faith; for sight of them we cannot have in this state and stage of our being. As S. Paul says, "There is a natural body and there is a spiritual body," and manifestly the senses and faculties that are capable of and adapted to the cognition of the one cannot be adapted to the comprehension of the other.

In the natural world and in natural science, we do comprehend much that we have never seen. We can even imagine what no one has ever seen. But one's ideas of such objects are always made up of elements—"the matter"—derived by our senses, or by consciousness in the acts of actual observation of real objects themselves. To recur to our chemical illustration. The chemist in his laboratory, with all of the sixty-four or five elements at his command, can make compounds that are found nowhere in nature. He can put elements together as they are not combined in the world around him,—always, of course, observing Dalton's law of definite and multiple proportions,—but he can make no new element and can get none, except as he gets it by analysis from something already in existence around him.

So with the elementary ideas we get by actual cognition of things around us and the mind within us. We can combine them under certain limitations so as to form complex ideas of such things as exist, though we have not seen them; and, moreover, of such things as do not exist and never have existed anywhere. Of this kind are the ideas of centaurs and other monsters of ancient mythologies. Of this kind also are, in the estimation of most people, the sea-serpents and "the missing link" that is sometimes spoken of as connecting man with the monkeys.

But in all these cases our power to form ideas is limited by the elements we have; and the elements we have have been obtained in one or the other of the two ways already indicated at the beginning of this article. Now, if there be a spiritual world, and if by that we mean anything different from matter, which is exceedingly attenuated and evanescent; if, in fact, we mean something that is not material and subject to all the limitations and imperfections of matter, growth, and decay, confinement to place, had an origin in time, and is subject to dissolution if not annihilation in the end, then it must be something of which we lack the means to form definite ideas; something with regard to which no revelation can be made, such as will make it as distinct and intelligible as the facts and truths of natural science, such as can make it anything more than an object of faith and hope, for which we may labor and pray, but for which also we must wait till we shall have been clothed upon with that immortality that awaits us all. In view of that world we are like the blind before the beauties of nature. We hear the sounds; we perceive the delicious odors as they are wafted to us by the breezes that come to us from them. We know that they are real and are somewhere. But we have no eyes to see them, nor have we the means to understand the words that others might use in describing them to us, though our ears may be never so open and our hands ready to grasp them if they should come within our reach. We can believe in them as facts, pursue them as objects of hope, though the mode and manner of their existence and of their very presence amongst us is as unintelligible and incomprehensible as are colors to the blind.

II. But there is another limitation to the possibilities of revelation. The one already considered may be regarded as a limitation of our power to form ideas of objects; this latter is a limitation of our power to comprehend truths and principles in regard to the facts or objects.

We begin our knowledge by the observation — sense-perception — of objects and facts. But these objects are all of them in groups; they stand related to causes and laws; to general facts and comprehensive principles. As we learn, we progress in knowledge and with every step in advance, we not only grow wiser by having more knowledge, but our capacity to understand and comprehend increases, and that becomes not only

intelligible, but in some cases apparently self-evident, a matter of the common sense of all men, which at an earlier stage was utterly beyond our powers of comprehension. The child cannot possibly understand how the revolution of the earth on its axis can occasion all the phenomena of the apparent rising of the Sun, the gloam of the evening, and the deep darkness of midnight. We see the apple fall, and it is easy to understand how the earth, by attracting it, can bring it down. But it is a triumph of scientific attainment to see and comprehend the law of gravity in all of its comprehensive relations to the unnumbered objects of this material universe.

So in human affairs. The acts of men and women we see and understand — some of them at least — when taken one by one. But when taken collectively, several of them making part of a system, denoting and expressing, or rather implying a plan, a purpose, with an ultimate end or aim, we find it more difficult to understand, if not the acts themselves, yet their "meaning;" and sometimes we find it wholly impossible to do so; and we come to the conclusion that they have no meaning, denote no purpose. Some persons are much quicker in their penetration than others into such matters, and all persons become more able to understand, and quicker to understand such things with every increase in their self-knowledge and their experience of the world.

Now if we recognise God as the Creator and Moral Governor of the universe, we must see and feel at once that not only are His ways above our ways, but His plans must, in many respects at least, be entirely beyond any powers of comprehension that we possess, or any finite mind can possess; that which seems evil or without purpose in, or from, one point of view may be seen to be good in no other. The cutting off of a man's hand may seem a piece of heartless cruelty; but when seen as an act performed as a means to save the life of a sufferer, our judgment of the act and our feelings towards the persons engaged in it are entirely changed; the act is seen in a new light and with a comprehension of the facts in the case, which is impossible for the idiot, and not quite comprehensible to the child without experience of life. And often in discussing the affairs of the world we come to facts, and to calls to duty, and to opinions and judgments on the one thing, or directly its opposite, such that we cannot rise to the full comprehension of the case

540 *Some Limits to the Possibility of Revelation.*

before us. All heroism, all self-sacrifice, all martyrdom for the cause of humanity and the truth, come from a higher and more comprehensive view of life, its duties and its possibilities, than is possible for the mere grovelling intellect of the worldly wise. Such acts become possible just as we rise, and only as we rise, above the mere instincts and intelligence of animal life, up towards—towards, not to—the infinite wisdom that comprehends all things and sees all things as God only can see them in their relation to one another.

Now revelation—that, I mean, of which we have a record in the Hebrew Scriptures—began in the infancy of the human race. At that time men knew nothing of the solar system, the real facts of astronomy, nothing of modern chemistry, nothing of what we now call geology, and of geography they did not know of course of the existence of much of what now constitutes the inhabited globe. Consequently, whatever Moses might know or may have known, and doubtless God could have inspired him with all knowledge on these subjects, a thousand times more than modern wise men possess, yet he could not have communicated it to the men to whom he spoke, and for whose guidance he wrote the precious words we now have. Every father of a family finds it necessary at times to talk to his children, not in the exact terms and technical phrases of science or of the lecture-room, but in such words as will guide them and persuade them to what, for his sake and for theirs, they ought to do. A physician can seldom, if ever, tell his patient all that he knows of his case or of the mode of treatment and the results of the remedies he prescribes. In some cases the patient could not understand the matter, and in others it would be very harmful for him to know even so much about it as he could understand. Some of us can remember the time when the sufferings of the wicked in the next world were supposed to be physical—actual “fire and brimstone,” and the “gnawing worm;” and when it would have been in effect, and practically, the same to deny this feature of their punishment as to assure them that there would be no punishment at all.

If we turn to the New Testament we find an illustration of the point we have under consideration. We find that our Lord began by teaching in parables, for the reason, as He Himself assigned it, that the people could not understand the principles which He wished to inculcate, while they would understand

and remember the parable as a narrative, and they, by and by, would, perhaps, come to see its meaning. And I will venture to add the full meaning of some of these parables has not even yet, in our days, and after eighteen centuries of study and experience, been so fully revealed that all men are agreed as to what it really is.

But even in regard to the twelve chosen disciples. He said on the last occasion before his crucifixion [*S. John* xvi. 12] that He had many things to say unto them which they could not bear even then. And after the resurrection, and after all the instructions of the great forty days, they were still to wait for the outpouring of the HOLY GHOST, which was to come not many days afterwards. And it seems to me that there are many passages in the Acts and in the Epistles that show that even the Apostles, with all their inspiration added to what their natural gifts and experience had taught them, were not fully masters of "the plan of salvation" in all its bearings and comprehensiveness.

I will just allude to one more topic in passing. Our LORD spoke of several cases as demoniacal possessions. Did He accept and intend to endorse and teach the prevailing theory on the subject? or did He know, as many modern men believe, that they were but cases of certain forms of disease, as epilepsy and insanity? If He had had the modern view the people of His age could not have understood it, perhaps, at all; and in any event it would have taken all the time of more than His three years of public ministry to correct the prevalent error on that subject, and teach them what is after all a mere matter of pathology and medicine, and of no great value, perhaps no practical value, to the great object for which He came into the world.

Here, then, is an obstacle to a full revelation of much that we would be glad to know, or rather a difficulty in the way of an effectual revelation, rising out of our inability to understand and comprehend what must be the subject-matter of the revelation, or alluded to in the course of it, if one is to be made. We see it, feel it, and acknowledge this kind of difficulty sometimes with a feeling of regret, in its relation to those who are beneath us in point of intelligence and whom we may have an occasion to guide and influence in their conduct. But we are slow to realise it in its application to ourselves, and to subjects that are

above us. We sometimes speak and act as if there was no such region above us, — that there is nothing we could not comprehend if only it had been unfolded, and if God had seen fit to disclose and explain it to us in the revelation He has made.

I think it must be manifest from these considerations, (1) that there are and must be in this universe some things of which we can form no definite idea, and which are, in relation to us, much the same as the objects of this world would be to men who had no eyes to see, or means of contact so as to touch or feel them. We are much in regard to them, in fact, as scientists now are with regard to the so-called "ether" that is supposed to surround and to pervade all things, filling all space without gravity, without impenetrability or hardness, and without, in fact, any one of the sensible properties of matter, which nevertheless is believed to exist because, and only because, the things that are known to exist and all do see, often act and are acted upon as though there were such a substance both as a means and a medium of their actions upon other things ; and (2) that there must be doctrines and dogmas concerning the Divine nature and the plans and principles of the moral government and providential control and direction of the affairs of this world of which no revelation that has been, or can be, made can bring within the range of our comprehension, or rather can raise us up to the power and grasp of comprehending : they are, and must be, farther above us than our plans and purposes are above the comprehension of the children we often have to control.

This discussion should have two practical results, to which we will just allude in conclusion.

1. The first is that, when properly considered and fully appreciated, they will serve to take away the very foundation from and thus deprive of all force the sceptic and infidel objections to revelation, and the progressive development, or "evolution," if they prefer the word, of that system from the first vague hints, represented as having been given to our first parents in Eden, and the full development in the incarnate Son of Mary and the completed system of Christian theology. What we can see and understand is but a small part of what is and must be in the domain of reality. Eternity and endless progress are before us. If we knew it all now, it is very doubtful indeed if life could be considered worth living. But we see that as we

advance we may have both new faculties and senses for perception and an enlargement of the powers of comprehension which we already possess, as we approach Him who, in the infinitude of His wisdom, knows all things, even the end from the beginning. But we must begin,—enter the Kingdom of Heaven as little children, and be content, now and always, both here and hereafter, to grow in knowledge as we grow in age and in likeness to our LORD JESUS CHRIST.

2. The second result is that we shall see the necessity of great caution in our dogmatism and doctrinal statements; greater, perhaps, than we have been accustomed to exercise.

Even in the matter of the physical sciences we have seen that Moses did not commit himself—when properly understood—to certain views which all had been accustomed to ascribe to him, but which recent discoveries have shown to be false. There is nothing to show that Moses did not know in regard to these very subjects—chemistry, geology, astronomy, and even evolution itself—more than any of our modern scientists who sometimes talk glibly about the mistakes of Moses. We see that there is one mistake, at least, that he did not make. He did not talk to the people of matters that were above their comprehension in a way to lead them to unbelief, to blasphemy, and to the utter disregard of all moral obligations. His teaching was adapted to their capacities, and designed to lead them onward and upward, preparing them for higher developments and fuller disclosures of truth as the ages and generations of men should pass away. If he had not made the beginning, it is possible there would have been no "Modern Science" for us to talk about and glory in.

Doubtless the sacred writers have used forms of expression that are not current and intelligible in our days. They have employed words and statements which, when taken literally, and according to their obvious meaning, imply or teach what we do not believe or accept as an adequate statement of the fact or doctrine. But we all do so, to some extent. Whenever we have occasion to speak to people of subjects that are beyond their present attainments we do not hesitate to say, even the most scrupulously scientific of us, the "Sun rises," "the Sun sets," though we know that such is not the case. It is only when we are teaching astronomy that we find it necessary to explain our words or to guard against misapprehension. Our

LORD spoke of demoniacal possessions. Was He teaching pathology and the science of hygiene? Or was He teaching divinity, "how the heavens go, or the way to go to Heaven," the way of forgiveness of sins and the healing of the soul, and only used the common forms of expression without intending to adopt the theory that the words He used implied?

But when we come to doctrines or dogmas of a purely spiritual or supernatural nature the caution becomes the more important. I believe that all attempts to put the doctrines concerning the incarnation, the Divine nature, and the Atonement into scientific forms from the Creed of Nice to the times of Calvin, the Augsburg Confession and the XXXIX Articles of our Church, have involved difficulties which give rise to doubts at the least whether the men who penned those documents, or suggested the phraseology that was used, fully comprehended the doctrines they were trying to set forth for the apprehension of the faithful and as a test of their orthodoxy or soundness in the faith.

The moment we get beyond what we fully comprehend reasoning becomes dangerous, and there is no infallible way of avoiding an ambiguous middle and other forms of what is called fallacy in diction. When the fact is beyond our comprehension we have no means of looking beneath the words to see what is the real meaning of the author; no means of protecting ourselves against error, or assigning to the words such a meaning as the author never intended them to have, and deriving from them a conclusion that is quite contrary to what he really intended to teach.

Now these considerations, while they teach us to be cautious, do also tend in the direction of liberality in the allowance of diversities of opinions in regard to doctrines and dogmas, the moment we go beyond mere facts and institutions that are, from their very nature, obvious and within the powers of comprehension of all men as commands of duty to be obeyed. But duties to be performed, as well as institutions to be observed, should be so plain and so plainly stated as to be wholly intelligible, if not to all persons, yet at least to those whose duty it is to instruct and guide others. But when we come to doctrines and dogmas no such degree of clearness is necessary, and, as I think, we have now seen that it is not possible and perhaps not, on the whole, desirable that this should be.

And yet there is danger of going too far in this direction. The history of the Church has taught us this, at least, that no mistake in the matter of doctrine or dogma can be made that will not bring forth its evil fruit. The denial of the Divinity of CHRIST by the Arians undermined a proper appreciation of the Gospel, and led to the neglect of the means of salvation, and would have put Christianity itself on a level with the philosophies of human invention. A mistake in regard to the nature of the Holy Eucharist led to the doctrine of Transubstantiation, and, following from that mistake, the neglect of the instructions of the people in the great truths of the Gospel, and the inculcation of those moral principles without which — doctrines and duties — Christianity itself became but little, if any, better than some form of heathenism. So, in a later day, the idea that the true Church is but an invisible body of believers who have had, in whatever way and by whatever means, a certain inward "experience," has led to the loss of all idea of Church authority, in any proper sense of the word, to the rejection of the historic and Divine ministry and sacraments, and we have the multiplication of sects and the prevalence of irreligion and unbelief everywhere. But fix duties and institutions properly by canons, insist upon and explain them as far and as fully as possible, and there is little danger of serious error in doctrine. Let it be understood that the proper purpose of doctrine is to lead to duty, and that duty is rather the test of doctrine than, in this day and for us, doctrine a means of justification of departure from well known and established duty, and I think we are safe in the midst of any "winds of doctrine" that the providence of God may permit to blow around us. The one thing that the Gospel aims at is not, primarily, to make men understand mysteries, but it is to bring people into submission and obedience to God, and that by whatever means of sacrament, ministry, or other human agency He may choose to make use of for that purpose.

W. D. WILSON.

CONCERNING CHARITY ORGANISATION AND PAUPERISM.

Report of a Conference on Charities and on other subjects pertaining to the Prevention of Suffering, Pauperism, and Crime, held in Baltimore, April 15th and 16th, 1887, under the auspices of the Charity Organisation Society of Baltimore.

THE city of Baltimore enjoys a well-earned repute for the enterprising public spirit of its citizens. It needs but a glance at the pages of this report to see in this conference on charities no mean proof of that public spirit. The most notable men in the city for personal eminence and official positions were among the conveners of the conference and gave their time to its sessions ; and the list of specially-invited participants in the discussions contains the names of men known throughout the country for their large experience, breadth of view, and effective speech in connection with charity work.

The aim and general scope of the conference may be gathered from the topics stated for discussion at its successive sessions : The actual work of charity organisation societies here and elsewhere, from the point of view of those who are personally concerned in their management ; The exercise of public and private charity in large towns, considered in the light of the experience accumulated in various places ; Industrial pursuits and industrial training, as means of preventing Pauperism and correcting bad habits ; The Johns Hopkins Hospital, and the connection between Hospital work and organised charity. Besides these leading themes of discussion, subsidiary matters, such as Heredity in Pauperism and Crime, Tramp Legislation, Provident Savings Banks, Fuel Savings Societies, Friendly Inns and Wayfarers Lodges, were treated by competent speakers at the fifth and closing session. A paper by Dr. Herbert B. Adams, of the Johns Hopkins University, on the "Literature of Charities," was also read at this session, and is published as an appendix to the Report.

Mr. Charles J. Bonaparte, who presided at the concluding meeting, forcibly expressed the views and hopes of the projectors of the conference when he protested against the misapprehension that a charity organisation society was mainly a "detective agency for the discovery of bogus objects of charity." The detection of impostors is a necessary part of its work, but it is by no means the most important part. He said:

There is a general disposition, I think, among those who are to some extent in sympathy with our aims and purposes, to look at this matter somewhat in the ungallant light in which S. Paul looked upon marriage. He said that persons who married did well; but those who did not, did better. So it is supposed that those who give without discrimination do well; although those who give with discrimination and judgment do better. But it is the cardinal principle of the Charity Organisation Society that those who give without discrimination do not do well at all, but do ill. They not only do ill to the persons to whom they give alms, but they do a positive injury to their own character; because they attempt to persuade themselves that they are doing a good work, when they know in their consciences that they are not doing a good work at all. They attempt to persuade themselves—and, owing to the readiness with which human nature can generally be persuaded of anything by itself, they very often succeed in partially persuading themselves—that they are actuated by thoroughly philanthropic and kindly motives, and by purely disinterested sympathy for suffering humanity; when, in point of fact, the motives of their conduct are nothing better than selfishness, laziness, and moral cowardice. These are the characteristics that are promoted in the giver by the system of charity which teaches any one that he can benefit his needy, suffering fellow-men otherwise than by the thorough exercise of his best moral and intellectual faculties in their service. . . . We ask that to this great work of relieving distress and of preventing distress from producing vice and crime and all the evils attendant on ingrained pauperism, there shall be devoted the best powers of the human mind, and that we shall study it as carefully, as earnestly, as industriously, as we do the other departments of physical and moral science.

What pressing need there is for an intelligent study of the whole subject of charitable relief, the statistics of our great cities and of the older States of the Union painfully show. Yet it is in our great cities and older States that the resources of charity are most abundant. In Boston, in Philadelphia, in New York, there is certainly no lack of provision for the suf-

fering and destitute. Private beneficence as well as institutional charity flows in full stream, and public money sustains huge almshouses and hospitals and asylums. Nevertheless, the "bitter cry" of the poor here, as in London, pierces the air every winter.

Thoughtful students of social problems are satisfied that indiscriminate charity and faulty methods of administering relief are largely responsible for the inefficacy of the effort to extirpate pauperism. The evil is being fostered among us by the very means which are used to destroy it.

The waste of charitable funds under the common methods of unorganised, indiscriminate almsgiving, and the fearful demoralisation which follows such waste, is perhaps best illustrated by some London statistics of unquestionable authority. There are in the British metropolis ninety-two institutions for the general relief of poverty, with an aggregate yearly income of over one million eight hundred thousand dollars; there are one hundred and fifty-eight pensions and institutions for the aged, with an income of two million two hundred thousand dollars; and there are ninety-four homes and fifty-six orphanages with an aggregate yearly revenue of over one million six hundred thousand dollars. Besides this immense charity fund dispensed through institutions, there are the multitudinous Church charities and benefactions of which the clergy of all denominations and their helpers are the almoners, the sum of which it is manifestly impossible to estimate, but which is certainly very great. And over and above all these institutional and private charitable expenditures there is the public poor-relief, which, in the last week of November, 1886, was received by fifty-six thousand four hundred and sixty-six persons within the walls of the London poor-houses, and by thirty-seven thousand and ninety-four out-door paupers.

In spite of this provision of relief, so vast and so diverse, not a winter passes without lamentations and appeals on behalf of the starving poor of London. Is it not plain that the immense charity fund of the metropolis cannot be administered as it ought to be, and that there is a grievous waste going on? We need not expect deliberate malversation of trusts, or any considerable peculation. The waste is rather to be attributed to blind, indiscriminate giving on the part of the societies and individuals doing relief-work. Through such giving, poverty

speedily sinks into pauperism, and the stores of help provided for the succor of worthy poor people become the prey of the vicious and incorrigible.

The conviction that the traditional forms of charity were both wasteful and injurious to the community led to the formation, a few years ago, of the London Charity Organisation Society. Such friends of the poor as the late Lord Shaftesbury and Miss Octavia Hill, whose knowledge and practical philanthropy were beyond cavil or question, heartily favored the movement. The London Society has not labored in vain. Besides seeking to promote a more intelligent and systematic dispensing of relief, it has aimed to inculcate higher ideas of charity. It has taught people to think of the poor as needing something more than doles of food and fuel. It has insisted on the essential difference between poverty and pauperism, affirming that pauperism is a disease of the body politic which is often aggravated by blind, indiscriminate charity until it is past cure. Such teachings have borne good fruit.

Among the gratifying results of the Charity Organisation movement in London and elsewhere, none is more hopeful than the disposition to coöperation in relief-work. The feeling is becoming general that there must be "wisdom in charity," that there must be no more giving in the dark, at haphazard, without investigation and without system. At the same time there are hindrances and difficulties not a few. There is much need of patience and resoluteness on the part of the Charity Organisationists. The low materialistic view of human nature which regards the poor as simply so many backs and stomachs to be clothed and filled, is rife enough everywhere. But amongst those whose views of the poor are far higher and who are moved by genuine Christian charity, ideas about charitable relief-work seem to prevail which tend to hinder efficient co-operation. The common idea of a well-managed charity, whether hospital, or dispensary, or a general relief society, is of one which spends the smallest proportion of its income in administration. The society which dispenses the maximum of bread and blankets at the least cost per head is deemed the most successful charity. It has been very wittily suggested that the perfection of this kind of administration of relief would be, a basket placed in a public square, into which all who have anything to give might empty their gifts, and from which those

who thought they were needy might help themselves at will. This would reduce the cost of management to the price of the basket. The difference between this sort of administration of relief and a great fund distributed by two or three agents to as many thousand applicants is not very clearly discernible. To give charitable relief to poor people so as to lift them up into a condition of self-help and self-support is certainly what we ought to aim at, but it cannot be done on bald commercial principles, at an outlay of so much per head. In dealing with human spirits, the better the quality of the work the more costly it is likely to be.

The true test of efficient charitable relief is not to be sought in the amount of money given away, or in the large numbers of the recipients, but in the number of people lifted up and enabled to care for themselves. To accomplish so great a work as that of putting a broken-down or fallen family again upon its own feet something more than alms, perhaps something other than alms, is required. Gifts of money may simply weaken and degrade them. Octavia Hill, in her large experience, learned that it is not enough we can plead that what we do is *benevolent*; we must ascertain that it is really *beneficent* too. Here is the opportunity for the mightiest agency of charity, the Friendly Visitor. It is an old maxim of the Charity Organisationists that it is "not alms, but a friend" the poor chiefly need. They are out of heart and hope with their lot. The kindly interest and sympathy of a neighbor is the most helpful influence to bring to bear upon them, far superior to any official or even clerical visiting, however well meant.

Experience in many and different localities has proved that where there is the greatest ratio of Friendly Visitors to cases of need the restorations to self-support are most numerous, and that the proportion of Friendly Visitors and of families rendered self supporting to the number of cases treated is much larger in small communities than in the great towns. This is just what we should expect to find. The smaller the community the more thoroughly do the various social forces come into play, both for good and for evil. Every one knows his neighbor. In great cities there is practically no neighborhood of rich and poor. Population is distributed according to wealth; the poor are in one quarter, the middle classes in another, and the rich in the West End or on the Hill. In the

rural towns neighborhood means familiar acquaintance, which is an open way for all the offices of sympathy and beneficence. In the city it is only the poor who are the neighbors of the poor, unless the rich and well-to-do make themselves neighbors as Friendly Visitors, or as the Oxford University men at Toynbee Hall have done in the East End of London.

The cure of pauperism is evidently not feasible by legislation or by lavish expenditure in alms ; but so far as it is curable at all, it will be by the personal influence of those who in the spirit of CHRIST and following His example give themselves to this blessed work. As one of the speakers at the Baltimore Conference aptly said: "We must *touch* the poor ; we can do nothing with a ten-foot pole. Personal contact of the helper with the helped inspires the poor with self-respect, kindles in them something of nobleness. The poor are bankrupt in brain, in heart, in hope, in inventiveness, in resources, in self-government. It is these which need to be reinforced and built up."

R. G. MOSES.

MISSION WORK IN JAPAN.

THE PAST, THE PRESENT, AND THE FUTURE.

THE Christian Faith, unless all signs fail, is on the eve of the greatest victory that it has gained since the conquest of the Roman Empire. Never in all that time has there been any such event as the conversion of a civilised nation of more than thirty-seven millions of people to the Faith of CHRIST. There has indeed been wonderful progress in all this period. What once were barbarous or semi-barbarous tribes have grown, largely under the influence of Christianity, to great nations, leading, and almost monopolising, the progress of the world. The number of Christians has increased, century by century, until now they far outnumber the adherents of any other faith.* But there has not been without the boundaries of Christendom any conquest for the Cross that can be compared in magnitude with that which will be gained when Japan becomes a Christian country. What has been done in the Sandwich Islands, in Madagascar, in New Zealand, in Fiji is wonderful indeed, but the people of all of these together are insignificant when compared with the people of Japan. So the barbarians of Europe, at the time of their conversion, could not for a moment be compared with the Japanese as they are now. And although the

* The ordinary statistics, by which Buddhists are made to outnumber Christians, are totally misleading. The difference between Quakerism and the Church of Rome is trifling as compared with the differences between sects who are all classed together as Buddhists, but who have almost nothing in common except the name, and a few merely outward and material resemblances. To call all Mohammedans Christians would be very much more reasonable than to consider as adherents of one religion all who call themselves Buddhists. And this is not all, for in China, which contains most of the adherents of Buddhism, this is only one belief among many, and the same man is often Buddhist, Taoist, Confucianist, and ancestor-worshipper all in one. Taking Christians and Mohammedans together, it is probable that there are from five to six hundred millions of people who believe in one God, Creator and Governor of the world, who has revealed himself in JESUS CHRIST, while it is extremely improbable that even a third as many are so agreed on any other creed.

remoter result of the conversion of those barbarians was to change the whole history of the world, who can say what the remoter results may be of the conversion of Japan, in the Christianising of the great continent of Asia, and of Africa, in the infusing of new courage and strength into the Church for its work in Christian lands, and in the stopping of the mouths of those mistaken people who prate of the decadence of the Christian Faith?

If, then, I am right in maintaining, with most of those best qualified to judge, that the time is within sight, perhaps not half a generation distant, when the Christian Faith shall stand without a rival in Japan, and the great mass of its people shall profess allegiance to it, and that the forces are in full tide of successful working which are to bring this about, certainly in endeavoring to show what has been done and what may reasonably be looked for in that country I am dealing with a subject of vast importance, and one that ought to excite the profoundest interest in the Church. Here are solid facts and reasonable hopes such as ought to warm the heart and stir the blood of every Christian man. I hope not altogether to spoil them in the telling.

The history of missions in Japan in our day divides itself into three stages, corresponding to three periods in the history of the country. Those three periods are, that of feudalism, the period of revolution, and the period of peaceful progress. When, in 1859, after the opening of the country to foreign residents and commerce, the first missionaries came, the feudal system was still in full force. The country was divided amongst numerous petty princes, each with his castle and his little army of retainers, his separate system of administration and finance. The Mikado, the rightful emperor, was living in retirement at Kioto, as his ancestors had done for generations before him, revered, but not obeyed. The Shogun, who, nominally subject to the Mikado, but really independent of him, represented such central authority as there was, was unable to make his power felt in any such manner as his great ancestors had done, and his government was at its wits' end between exacting foreign governments on the one side and insubordinate subjects on the other. Underneath the surface was burning the fierce national spirit, the fervent loyalty to the ancient imperial house, which was to overthrow feudalism, and start Japan

upon its wonderful career of progress, but outwardly the old system remained, and ancient customs and feelings were still in full force. It was not until 1868 that the revolution came, the Mikado was restored to his rightful position in the state, and not the power of the Shogun alone, but that of all the daimios or feudal princes as well, fell like a castle of cards, never to rise again.

This revolution was the work of what at first was the anti-foreign party. But the logic of events and the wonderful national genius together soon brought about a radical change of feeling. It was seen that patriotism did not necessarily involve hatred either of foreign ways or of the foreigners themselves, but ought to lead to the adoption, from whatever source, of everything that promised to benefit the country, and to the aiming after a position of amicable equality and friendly rivalry with the most advanced nations of the world. Accordingly, the revolution that was to have been the restoration of the old, became the inauguration of the new. With the establishment of a strong central government many things became possible in the way of progress which under the old régime would have been altogether impracticable. Notable among these was the establishment, upon a totally new basis, of the administrative, the judicial, and the educational systems of the country. For administration, a system was adopted like that of France. The country was divided into a number of districts, not at all coterminous with the old provinces, and at the head of each was placed a governor corresponding to the French *prefet*. Now, the power of this official is considerably modified by the existence of elective assemblies, having a certain control over taxation and expenditure, in each district. The judicial system established was substantially similar to that of other civilised countries, consisting of courts of various grades, in which appeal may be taken from lower to higher, the judges being confined to purely judicial functions. The educational system adopted was most complete, with a university of high grade at the head, and a vast system of common schools, stretching throughout the whole country, at the base. It is this system of public education, based upon Western models, that more than any other one thing has made the progress of Japan solid and enduring, not merely a surface veneer of Western civilisation, but a genuine transformation of the whole people.

Along with all this went also organisation upon approved models of the various departments of the central government, those of war, of the navy, of public works, of post-offices, and telegraphs. At the same time the establishment of newspapers everywhere, in which questions of the day were discussed, kept the people alive to the changes which were taking place.

It is difficult to draw the line precisely between this second period of revolution and the third, that of peaceful progress. Even during this latter period great changes have been made, and the greatest of all, the assembling of the National Parliament in 1890, is yet to come. Still, in spite of this, and of an unsuccessful rebellion in 1877, the main characteristic of the secular life of Japan in the last twelve or fifteen years has been the peaceful enjoyment and gradual perfection by experience of the reforms made during the period of revolution.

To these three periods answer three stages in the mission work. During the first old customs and prejudices were still in force. All foreigners had to be carefully guarded. There were thousands of men who would have gloried in the opportunity to assassinate a foreigner, and would willingly have sacrificed life in so patriotic a cause. The ancient laws against Christianity were still in force, and were still sustained by public opinion, which looked upon the Christian Faith as an evil and accursed thing, subversive of all morality, and destructive to patriotism. During this period, it is obvious, but little could be done, except to study the language and the people and prepare for future work.

Then came the tremendous intellectual revolution which accompanied the sudden adoption of European ways. The mind of all the thinking class was set upon purely secular and material progress. All that seemed most advanced in the thought of the West was eagerly seized upon. Herbert Spencer and John Stuart Mill became the idols of Japanese thinkers, and reached among their new worshippers a height of towering preëminence beyond anything they had ever attained among their own people. Under the guidance of the new lights the old Buddhist faith was thrown aside as unworthy the attention of enlightened men. And in this contempt Christianity also shares. Not merely heathen religion, but all religion, was thought to be outgrown, and a new age, in which faith and worship should have no place, seemed to be dawning upon men's

sight. This state of mind was greatly strengthened by the influence of a few foreign infidels, whose falsehoods were readily believed when they declared that Christianity had been thrown aside by the intelligent and educated men of Europe and America.

The second stage of mission work was among people in this state of mind. It was difficult, but by no means so difficult as before. New prejudices, though violent enough, were not as strongly rooted as the old ones. They could be overcome, and were overcome, in many cases, when once a hearing was obtained. Outward difficulties in the way of gaining such a hearing were now done away with. The laws against Christianity were taken down from the notice boards, and no longer enforced. The Faith could be openly preached without hindrance, and openly professed without danger. The old hatred of the foreigner was gone, and travel through the interior of the country became as safe as in any other land. Through schools and medical work, and by other means, a hearing for the Gospel was gained, and the work spread with what in almost any other country than Japan would be extraordinary rapidity. Christian congregations sprang up here and there, shining like lights in a dark place, and some vague idea of what Christianity really was began to spread widely among the people.

It was partly through this, and partly through the natural working out to its results of the anti-Christian system, that the mission work came to its third stage, which may be said to include the last three or four years. In Japan it has been fairly shown what the natural results of atheism and agnosticism are. An atheist or agnostic brought up in a Christian land cannot shake off the influence of his Christian training and Christian environment, and, if he is a moral man, that proves nothing as to whether the natural effect of his belief is morality or immorality. But in Japan there has been neither Christian training nor Christian public opinion to complicate the problem, and infidelity has had every opportunity to show what its legitimate fruits are. And what has been the result? A great moral deterioration, showing itself mainly in the very class among whom atheism and agnosticism had gained their great victories, the class of educated and intelligent men. This is acknowledged and deplored by the wisest and best among the Japanese people, by many of those who have been themselves affected by

the taint. The thinking men of Japan have come to see that religion is not outgrown. That religion, on the contrary, is necessary to the welfare of any country is a proposition as generally entertained among them now as was its opposite a few years ago.

And this is not all. While infidelity has been showing its moral weakness, the Christian Faith has side by side with it been showing its moral power. Everywhere throughout the country there are cases, well known in their respective neighborhoods, of men reformed and transformed by the power of the Gospel of CHRIST, drunkards who have become temperate, libertines who have become pure, selfish men who have become actively interested in the good of their fellows. The Japanese now need the testimony of no one to the life-giving power of the Gospel. They themselves have seen it with their own eyes.

To convince Japanese thinkers that Christianity is true is a somewhat slower process than to convince them that it is good. The latter they cannot deny. But the former also many have come to believe, and the great majority are much nearer to believing than they were. They have at least discovered that they were deceived when they were told that educated and intelligent men in Europe and America had ceased to believe in the Christian Faith. Among other things a great deal of effect was produced upon the Japanese, who are natural hero-worshippers (their ancient Shinto religion is simply hero-worship), by a message sent by Prince Bismarck and the Emperor William to the Mikado, to the effect that the Christian Faith was what Japan was most in need of.

Convinced, then, that the Christian Faith possesses that moral power which is now Japan's greatest need, and knowing that there is much to be said in favor of its truth, the educated mind of the country is looking with favor and hope on the progress that it is making. The most influential newspapers advocate it, the most eminent statesmen favor it, the most disinterested patriots are actively interested in its spread. It is true that the number of Christians is still small as compared with the population of the country, probably not much above a hundred thousand, all told. But these are in large proportion men of education and intelligence, the very class best fitted to carry on the mission work among their own countrymen. And the rate of increase is very rapid,—in the more flourishing Protestant

missions something like sixty or seventy per cent. per annum. Moreover, a raising of even this enormous percentage is not among the impossibilities. Such a rate of increase, if maintained, would make Christians of a large majority of the people in less than fifteen years. Of course it would not be safe to prophesy this. In any other country it would be almost insanity even to imagine it. But in Japan hardly anything in the way of rapid progress is impossible. And in any case, whatever period it may require to bring the mass of the Japanese people into the Church of CHRIST, the victory is virtually gained when the leaders of thought and of progress are won. Most of these are now more or less favorably inclined to the cause, and at the rate at which the work is moving, it can be but a few years before the better part are Christians, and actively engaged in propagating the faith among their own people. The forces which have effected what has been so far gained are still working and daily increasing in strength. Some of the difficulties have disappeared, and others are fast disappearing. Buddhism, once practically the religion of Japan, and still retaining a nominal hold upon the lower classes, does not, except in one or two provinces, offer opposition enough even to make a contest, while the attitude of the thinking people of the country, once a formidable obstacle, is now, as we have seen, a powerful help.

And now it may be well to turn aside to say a word or two about the missionary agencies through which this work has been accomplished. These divide themselves into three great classes, Protestant, Russo-Greek, and Roman.

Of these, the Roman missions report the largest number of converts. And it is worthy of note that the greater part of these are in the same neighborhood in which the great successes of the old Jesuit missions under Xavier were gained. Christianity seemed indeed to have been absolutely stamped out there. But nothing ever took its place. Neither Buddhism nor Shintoism gained any hold among the people. And some tradition doubtless lingered which prevented the growth of any such horror of Christianity as an evil thing, as prevailed throughout the rest of the country. Perhaps also this same tradition rendered the Roman Church more acceptable to the people of this region than any other.

In spite, however, of the great acquisitions which have been made in this way, and in spite of the large force which it has at

work (three bishops, perhaps fifty priests, and many sisters), the future of Romanism in Japan does not look bright, because of the interference, real or supposed, of the old Jesuit missionaries in matters of politics and government, and because of the reputation for intermeddling in such matters which the Church of Rome has gained by its course in other countries, the educated intelligence of Japan is strongly set against it. The fierce patriotism of the Japanese takes fire at once at any suggestion of meddling by a Pope in any of the affairs of their country, and I do not believe that the Roman Church will ever become a great power there.

In numerical strength the Russo-Greek mission stands, or lately stood, next after the Roman. The work done by it has been truly a wonderful one, and the head of that mission, Bishop Nikolai, is by all odds the most remarkable man engaged in missionary labor in Japan. He came to the country some twenty years or more ago as chaplain to the Russian Legation, and soon became deeply interested in mission work among the Japanese. He succeeded also in arousing an interest among the members of his own church in Russia that supplied him with means for the prosecution of his work. He never had more than perhaps half a dozen assistants in the work from his own country, not more than as many as some of the weaker Protestant missions. But he set himself with great vigor and enthusiasm to build up a system of native agencies. He established and successfully maintained, largely by the power of his own strong personality, a school in Tokio, in which young men were gathered and trained, and sent out to work as lay evangelists in different parts of the country. Through their means, under his direction, a large body of Christians has been gathered, and great good has been done.

But just as in the case of the Roman mission, the future prospects of the mission of the Russian Church are hardly in proportion to its present numerical importance. The work which Bishop Nikolai has instituted is so large as to be beyond the power of one man thoroughly to oversee. And the same forces which operate against the Roman Church operate also in large measure against the Greek. The two are usually classed together by the Japanese as *kin-kyō*, "the old teaching," as opposed to Protestantism, which they call *shin-kyō*, or "the new teaching," and public sentiment among the better classes is as

opposed to the first as it is favorable to the second. The ritual of both Roman and Greek, moreover, excites prejudice. The argument that where in heathenism an elaborate and ornate ritual has prevailed, an elaborate Christian ritual is most likely to be acceptable to the people, totally fails in Japan. Japanese Christians as a rule strongly dislike everything which resembles the practices of the Buddhism which they have discarded. Their new wine cannot be put into old bottles, but requires a vessel of a totally different kind. Liturgical worship is indeed gaining ground among Protestants in Japan, as in this country, but both Greek and Roman missions are a good deal handicapped by their ritual, especially by its external resemblance to that of Buddhism.

Some Churchmen may perhaps be disposed to take exception to my classing the missions of our Church and of the Church of England together with those of other Christian bodies as Protestant. But there is in this no surrender of the historical position of the Church. And in Japan, no other classification would so well represent the facts. Even in this country, however illegal and irregular we may think the ecclesiastical organisations of the various Protestant denominations to be, there are a thousand ties which bind our people and theirs, and set us off together whether we will or no, as one Protestant community. In Japan, where there are no ancient traditions of sectarian strife to weaken the natural unity of Christian people, this nearness to each other of those who have been brought to CHRIST by the work of the Anglican Church, and of those bodies that have sprung from her, is much more marked and decided than here. Our classification is founded, then, upon no theory, true or false, but upon a fact, and a fact full of most blessed promise for the future,—the fact of the actual unity in heart and sympathy of the Christians of these Protestant missions, with whom chiefly seems to lie the future of the Church of Japan.

Without going into the details of the work of these missions, I may note several characteristics which are common to all. The first of these is the very large proportion of the work which is done by native workers. It is, of course, impossible to speak with numerical exactness of such a matter as this, but roughly speaking, I should be disposed to say that not more than a tenth, possibly not even a twentieth, of the work of preaching is done by the foreign missionaries. The native preachers, lay

and clerical, are not only the more numerous, they are incomparably the more effective. The foreign preacher can rarely in any country be more than a temporary makeshift, and in Japan his work is almost done. When, as will soon be the case, curiosity to hear the foreigner shall have abated, and the feeling that his account of Christian teaching is more likely to be accurate than that of the native worker shall have passed away, it will be hardly worth while for any but a few missionaries of exceptional attainments in the language to attempt to preach to the heathen at all. And even as preachers to Christian congregations, their work cannot last long. Something still remains for them to do in the way of oversight of catechists and lay evangelists, and of theological teaching, but it is pretty safe to say that in ten years, or even less, the work of foreign missionaries will be practically ended.

Side by side with the assumption by native Christians of the practical work of evangelisation goes the assumption of the pecuniary burdens of the work. The number of self-supporting congregations, paying the salaries of native pastors, as well as all other expenses, is now quite large, especially so in the Congregational missions. The independence of the Japanese, their strong dislike to be dependent upon or in any way dominated by foreigners, acts powerfully to help on this movement. Whoever helps the work of the Japanese Church, emphatically "helps those who help themselves."

Another marked characteristic of the Protestant mission work is the spirit of unity before spoken of. This has already shown itself in a strong movement towards organic union. Presbyterians North and South, with the German and Dutch Reformed Churches of America, are already united in one powerful Presbyterian body, and negotiations have for some time been in progress for their union with the Congregationalists. This is almost solely a native movement, the Japanese having control practically of the Presbyterian and solely of the Congregational organisation, since they outnumber the foreigners in the former, and are quite by themselves in the latter, the missionaries not being ecclesiastically connected with the native congregations. The uniting of the three Methodist denominations at work in Japan¹ is also spoken of. Finally, in our own missions, the work

¹ Methodist Episcopal, Canadian Methodist, and Evangelical Association of North America.

of the English and American Churches has been united into one organisation, and the first Synod held of the Church of Japan comprising the two bishops, American and English, all the clergy, native and foreign, and delegates from the several native congregations. The first day of the session of this Synod, and according to accounts one of the most interesting, was devoted to the discussion of a larger unity than that which the members of the Synod were then accomplishing. Such a larger unity, which shall take in the great mass of Protestant Christians, without sacrificing Apostolic Order as this Church has received it, is not only a possibility, but a possibility not very remote.

It might perhaps be inferred from what I have said that there is no need for reinforcing the little band of foreign missionaries sustained by our Church in Japan. But this would be a great error. The time is short for the work of foreign missionaries, but while the time lasts that work is of immense importance. And as it is mainly a work of the training and oversight of native workers, it is plain that the quality of the men needed is high. The limit of age for appointment is by the rules of our Domestic and Foreign Missionary Society (not wisely, I believe, for the present crisis in Japan) fixed at thirty years. But men just from the seminary are not the kind that we ought to have. While the limit of age is so fixed it must be adhered to. But within that limit, the greater the experience and knowledge of the world the better. Besides this, the men to be sent to Japan should be men of good sense and of ability, of American or English birth, thoroughly well trained, and, if possible, with such tangible evidence of that training as can be appreciated by the Japanese, in the shape of a college degree. Why is it that in three years not one such man has been found and sent out to the work?

THEODOSIUS S. TYNG.

THE VOICE OF THE CHURCH OF ENGLAND ON EPISCOPAL ORDINATION.

ARTICLE III.

IT would be impossible to understand the bearings of the provisions of the *Act 13 Eliz. c. 12* without a somewhat detailed review of the various Articles to which subscription was enforced prior to the date of 1588 or 1589, which limits our inquiries. The object of these papers is to prove what was the Voice of the Church of England on Episcopal Ordination prior to the delivery of Bancroft's sermon on February 9, 1589, which Professor Nelson, by his quotation from Canon Perry, gives as the date for the first public setting forth of the doctrine of the exclusive validity of Episcopal ordination, in the Church of England. It is not our concern to show whether Presbyterianism be right or wrong, but simply to prove what the Church of England has said on the subject up to February 9, 1589. It is not our concern either to show what the English Reformers, or individual members of the Church, thought on the subject, but plainly to prove that the Church of England, as a Church, never accepted as in any way valid the ministrations of one not ordained, or consecrated, by a Bishop.

In tracing the history of subscription to Articles, back to their first origin, it is to Geneva and not to Rome, that we find the clergy owe enforcement of subscription to Articles of Religion. The Puritan and Presbyterian party who so bitterly railed against subscription to the successive Articles have to thank that foreign prince and potentate, that "busy intermeddler in foreign churches," that "infallible Arbiter in controversy," John Calvin, for its introduction into England.

It was Calvin who, as Collier says of him, "thought himself wiser than the Ancient Church, and fit to dictate Religion to all countries in Christendom," who wrote to Protector Somerset in 1548 to inform him as to his will and pleasure concerning Church and State in England. After commanding the Protec-

tor for the zeal and resolution* he had shown in retrieving religion, he unfolds his plan, which may be summed up as follows :—

i. A form of Common Prayer to be enforced on all subjects by the State.

2. Articles of Religion to which all Bishops and parish priests should be forced to subscribe, and that no person should be admitted to any ecclesiastical function without giving solemn consent to the doctrines received.

3. Both Papists and Gospellers † to be coerced by the sword.

Here then is the germ of all subscription and test acts.

Hooper, Calvin's apt pupil, when he had sufficiently overcome his scruples as to enable him to accept the See of Gloucester, followed his master's injunctions, set forth a series of Articles of his own, and took very kindly to enforcing them on his clergy.

Hardwick, in his Appendix III, has collated the xxxix Articles of 1562, with the preceding formularies, and also with these Articles issued by Hooper to his clergy.

We now come to the sixth head of our argument.

VI. THE ARTICLES.

The following table may help us to distinguish between these numerous formularies, and to understand their connection :

- i. The Articles of 1548.
- ii. The xlv Articles of 1551-2.
- iii. The xlii Articles of 1553.
- iv. The xi Articles of 1559.
- v. The xxxix Articles assented to by Convocation January 31, 1562.
- vi. The Advertisements of 1564.
- vii. Canons passed by Convocation of April and May, 1571.
- viii. Act of 13 Elizabeth, cap. 12, passed April or May, 1571.
- ix. Subscription to the xxxix Articles enforced by Parliament by said Act.

* Doubtless referring to his "zeal and resolution" in endeavoring to pull down Westminster Abbey wherewith to build himself a palace; or, to his unabated "zeal and resolution" in tearing down a stately cloister, two chapels, three bishop's houses, and two churches, for his palace, when bought off by the Dean with half the revenues of the Abbey.

† That is, the Puritan party, who were then also nicknamed "Pseudo-evangelicals."

- x. Order of Ecclesiastical Commissioners, June 7, 1571.
- xi. Parker's Three Articles, June, 1571.
- xii. Queen's Proclamation, October 20, 1573.
- xiii. The xv Articles passed by Convocation in March, 1576.
- xiv. Whitgift's Three Articles, April 15, 1584.
- xv. The xxiv Articles, May, 1584.

§ I. *The Articles of 1548.*

What these were, or how many they were, we cannot say. But that subscription was enforced to a set of Articles as early at least as the second year of the reign of Edward VI is beyond doubt, and possibly in the very first year.

Hooper, under date of February 27, 1549, writes:—

He (*i. e.* Archbishop Cranmer) has some Articles of Religion to which all preachers and lecturers in divinity are required to subscribe, or else a licence for teaching is not granted them. [Hardwick on the *Articles*, London, 1881, p. 72.]

Archbishop Whitgift, writing to Burghley July 15, 1584, says:—

But I have altered my first course of dealing with them for not subscribing only (justifiable by law, and in common practice in the time of King Edward, and from the beginning of her Majesty's reign to this day), and chosen this to satisfy your lordship. [Whitgift's Works, Parker Society, 1853, vol. iii. p. 607.]

Complaining of the rigorous way in which subscription had been enforced, a Marian Bishop, in a sermon November 12, 1553, at S. Paul's Cross, indignantly asks:—

Hathe there been anye spiritual promotion and dignitie, ye or almoste anye meane liyng of the Churche, *bestowed these few years past*, but vpon such onely, as would earnestly set furth (either by preaching, either by subscribing) al the erronius doctrine, falsi termed the Kinges procedinges? [Hardwick, p. 222, note.]

If, however, we are unable to give either the precise wording, or the number, of these Articles, we do know that three at least of them concerned the *Prayer Book*, the *Ordinal*, and the *Sacraments*, because it was to these three that Hooper objected in May, 1550, when nominated to the See of Gloucester. [Hardwick, p. 92.]

The *Prayer Book* and *Ordinal* being of course that of 1549,

the First of Edward VI, Hooper could not have objected to these Articles on account of their Puritanism, for he was the leading exponent of the Calvinistic school in England, and the determined foe of the *Ordinal* and *Prayer Book*.

Here then, at the very outset, we have a manifestation of the Puritan opposition to Subscription to the Articles on account of the *Prayer Book and Ordinal*. And we have also from the very beginning of the Reformation the determination of the Church that those seeking orders within her fold should bind themselves to uphold her teaching as formulated in her *Prayer Book*, and the form of *Episcopal Ordination* as laid down in her *Ordinal*.

So Hooper, notwithstanding his objections, found himself obliged to subscribe to them in 1551 before he could be consecrated Bishop; which proves that there must have been authority for these Articles else Hooper, anxious as he was to evade subscription to them, could have met the demand to subscribe by a point-blank refusal on the simple plea that they were unauthorised.

Hooper may be said to have been the first to have thrown down the gauntlet in the lists against the Church, on behalf of Puritanism, Presbyterianism, and the Parity-men, and summon her to open her gates wide to them.

From 1550 to the present day there have not been wanting men to reecho that challenge.

But what has been the action of the Church in reply?

Has she altered her *Prayer Book*, or her *Ordinal*?

Has she relaxed her formulaires of subscription to such a degree as to admit as her accredited ministers any non-Episcopally ordained?

Let the following brief survey of the successive series of Articles to those of 1548 answer these questions.

§ II. *The XLV Articles of 1551-52.*

These forty-five Articles may be found in Latin, taken from the State papers *Domestic*, Edward VI, vol. xv. No. 28, signed by six Royal chaplains, in Hardwick, p. 279 seq.

The Privy Council appear to have directed, in the year 1551, that they should be set forth by public authority. Some delay seems to have occurred in doing this, and consequently we find the Council writing, on May 2, 1552, to Archbishop Cranmer,

about the delay, and requesting that a copy of the Articles be forwarded to the Council.

Having made some alterations and additions, the Archbishop forwards a copy of the Articles, in September, 1552, to the Council. Finally a copy is submitted to the King with the request that the Articles be enforced as a test.

Six Royal chaplains are thereupon directed to report on the Articles, and these chaplains,—Harley, Bill, Horne, Perne, Grindal, and Knoks,—having signed a copy, in token of their assent, the Formulary is then sent, on November 20, to the Archbishop for the “last corrections of his judgment and pen.” Four days after, they are returned to the Council, accompanied by a request from Cranmer that all Bishops may have authority from the King “to cause all their preachers, archdeacons, deans, prebendaries, parsons, vicars, curates, with all their clergy, to subscribe to the said Articles.”

On June 19, 1553, in compliance with the Archbishop's wish, the Royal Order was issued that the new Formulary be publicly subscribed. The number of the Articles had, however, been reduced to forty-two since November, 1552.

As the thirty-eighth of these XLV Articles is the parent of all “the subscription Articles” objected to by those who fought against Episcopal Ordination, it is important to reproduce it here.

XXXVIII. De libro Ceremoniarum Ecclesiæ Anglicanæ. Liber qui nuperime auctoritate Regis et Parlamenti ecclesiæ Anglicanæ traditus est, continens modum et formam orandi et sacramenta administrandi in Ecclesia Anglicana: similiter et libellus ille, eadem auctoritate æditus, de ordinatione Ministrorum ecclesiæ, quoad doctrinæ veritatem pii sunt, et quoad ceremoniarum rationem salutari Evangelii libertati, si ex sua natura ceremoniæ illæ aestimentur, in nullo repugnant, sed probe congruant, et eandem in complurimis in primis promovent, atque ideo ab omnibus ecclesiæ Anglicanae fidelibus membris, et maxime a ministris verbi, cum omni promptitudine aminorum et gratiarum actione recipiendi, approbandi, et populo Dei sunt commendandi.

Now the English of the above is as follows, taking so far as it goes the translation of the thirty-fifth of the XLII Articles as set forth in 1553.

XXXVIII. Of the Book of Ceremonies of the Church of England. The Book which of very late time was given to the Church of Eng-

land by the King's authority, and the Parliament, containing the manner and form of praying and ministering the Sacraments in the Church of England, likewise also that book of ordering ministers of the Church, set forth by the foresaid authority, are godly with respect to the truth of their doctrine ; and with respect to the matter of ceremonies, if these ceremonies are estimated from their nature, are in no point repugnant to the wholesome doctrine of the Gospel, but are excellently agreeable thereunto, and further the same not a little ; and therefore by all the faithful members of the Church of England, and chiefly of the ministers of the Word, they ought to be received and allowed with all readiness of mind, and thanksgiving, and to be commended to the people of GOD.

It is quite true that these XLV Articles do not appear to have been actually enforced ; but their existence proves that even thus early the most moderate of Churchmen were pressed to defend the Prayer Book and Ordinal against the attacks of those who would have neither the Catholic doctrine nor the Threefold Ministry.

This attitude of the Reformers is well depicted in the words of Cranmer, as quoted by Hardwick, p. 68.

Lest any man should think that I feign anything of mine own head, without any other ground or authority, you shall hear by GOD's grace, as well the errors of the papist confuted as the Catholic truth defended both by God's sacred Word, and also by the most approved authors and martyrs of CHRIST's Church.

§ III. *The XLII Articles of 1553.*

We have seen in the preceding section that the XLV Articles, having been reduced by three, were by Royal Order of June 19, 1553, ordered to be publicly subscribed. The weight of authority is in favor of these Articles having been agreed to in Convocation prior to the issue of the King's order. The burning of the records of Convocation in the fire of 1666 makes proof in such things a matter of long and tedious research ; but the complaints of both Papists and Puritans prove that they were enforced. There is very little alteration between this Formulary and the XLV Articles.

The thirty-eighth, which we have already given at length, becomes the thirty-fifth of the XLII Articles, and as both a Latin and English version was set forth, we will content ourselves with giving the English.

XXXV. Of the booke of Praiers, and Ceremonies of the Churche of Englande.

The Booke whiche of very late time was geuen to the Churche of England by the Kinges Auctoritie, and the Parlamente, conteining the maner and fourne of praiyng, and ministring the sacramentes in the Churche of Englande, likewise also the booke of ordring ministers of the Churche, set foorth by the forsaid auctoritie, are godlie, and in no poincte repugnant to the holsome doctrine of the Gospel, but agreeable thereunto, ferthering and beautifying the same not a litle, and therefore of al faithful membres of the Churche of Englande, and chieflie of the ministers of the Worde, thei ought to be received and allowed with all readinesse of mind, and thankes geuing, and to bee commended to the people of God. [Hardwick, p. 340.]

If the opponents of the Church, and Church government, were dissatisfied with the thirty-eighth of the XLV Articles, they would not have less reason for dissatisfaction when this thirty-fifth Article was set forth, for if anything it is stronger than the former one. Nor would such persons derive much comfort from the thirty-third and thirty-fourth, which are identical with the thirty-sixth and thirty-seventh of the XLV Articles ; the former, on the Traditions of the Church, censures those who of their *private judgment willingly and purposely break the traditions and ceremonies of the Church* ; the latter on the Homilies declares them to be “godlie and holsome, conteining doctrine to be received of all menne.”

§ IV. *The Eleven Articles of 1559.*

When we were considering the Act of Uniformity [*Church Review* for October, p. 430] we saw what these Articles enjoined. Since the XLV and XI.II Articles, Cranmer had perished in the flames, and the authority of the Pope had had a brief sway. It would not have been strange to find that when fresh Articles were issued in Elizabeth's reign, they had been set forth with a view to greater strictness against the Papists and with more leniency to the Puritans.

Now, if ever, following the inevitable law of reaction, there ought to have been hopes for the minimisers of the Catholic faith and levellers of the Apostolic ministry. It is instructive to find that the Church authorities preserved the same calm and judicious attitude which is such an eminent characteristic of the Church of England. The Articles of Edward VI had not been

repealed by any express statute in Mary's reign, but they had nevertheless been considered as abrogated by the restoration of popery, and in this view Queen Elizabeth and Archbishop Parker seem to have concurred. Not waiting for the readoption of so elaborate a series of Articles as the XLII of Edward's reign, though such a series was being actually under consideration, and was soon to be published as the XXXIX Articles of 1562, there issued from the royal press "by order of both archbishops, metropolitans, and the rest of the bishops" the Eleven Articles of 1559.

Insisting that the Papist should grant that the Prayer Book was "Catholic and Apostolic," it provided in more emphatic terms that the Puritan should confess that it was not lawful for him to take any ecclesiastical ministry upon himself until called thereto in accordance with the Laws of the Realm.

What the Laws of the Realm were we have seen, when dealing with these Eleven Articles in the last issue of the *Church Review*. To quote our own words:

If a man appealed to the Ordinances of the Realm the Appeal lay to the Ordinal.

If a man appealed to the Ordinances of the Church the Appeal lay likewise to the Ordinal [p. 437].

The Eleven Articles were, as we have already observed [*Church Review*, October, 1887], to be read in public by all the clergy at their first entry into their cures *and twice a year thereafter*. They thus concerned the *continual practice and teaching of the clergy*; and moreover, while the subscription of any formulary was effected only between a Minister and his Ordinary, the public reading in church of a declaration worded throughout in the first person singular and ending with this exhortation, "I exhort you all of whom I have cure, heartily and obediently to embrace and receive the same," could not fail to act as a check on the clergy, since the laity could easily perceive whether the daily teaching of the Minister was the same as that embodied in the confession made under the "Eleven Articles."

§ V. *The XXXIX Articles of 1562.*

Of these Articles nothing need here be said, as we have not to deal with their doctrinal significance, but only with their enforcement by subscription. Subscription was not enforced till 1571, on reaching which date we will see what these Articles have to tell us on the matter in hand.

It may, however, be as well to note here, that all Church authorities, Archbishops, Bishops, Convocation, or Ecclesiastical Commissioners in their references to these Articles always refer to them as the Articles of 1562; and never even when enforcing subscription do they refer to the Statute Act of 1571, which by Parliamentary law made subscription compulsory on all the clergy, but always to the Articles as passed by the Convocation of 1562. The reasons of this silence we will examine later on, so as to keep the whole subject-matter under one head.

According to Soames, these Articles were passed on January 31, the Bishops seem to have subscribed to them on January 29, and the principal members of Convocation on February 5, 1562-3.

§ VI. *The Advertisements of 1564*

In the year 1563, and before the same Convocation that passed the Articles commonly called the Articles of 1562, there were submitted seven Articles for adoption by the Lower House.

Number 1 was against responsive singing, or reading, of the Psalms, and against all musical instruments. 2. Against lay Baptism and the sign of the Cross. 3. Against kneeling at the Holy Eucharist. 4. That the copes and surplices be laid aside and that the habit of the desk and the pulpit be the same. 5. Against gowns and caps. 6. That the clause in Article 33 of the Articles of 1552 against breaking the traditions and ceremonies be considerably softened down. 7. Against Saints' days. [See Collier's *Ecclesiastical History*, vol. ii. p. 486.]

Although, after considerable debate, these Articles were much modified, and reduced to six, yet they did not succeed in passing. The Puritan party, notwithstanding their defeat in Convocation, continued to set the law at defiance in their ministrations, and to uphold their conduct in the pulpit. Consequently the Queen, on January 25, 1564, wrote to the Primate, as head of the Ecclesiastical Commissioners, complaining of these irregularities "as tending to breed some schism or deformity in the Church." As the immediate consequence of that letter the Advertisements were issued in March. The chief provisions of these Advertisements were, so far as they concern our inquiry:

That all preachers should be "examined for their conformity in unity of doctrine."

That all licenses issued prior to the first of March be void, but to be renewed to meet persons.

That the celebrant, gospeller, and epistoler use copes; the surplice to be used in other ministrations.

That no ministers be "admitted to serve without testimony of the diocesan, from whence they come."

Concerning these Advertisements, Cardwell rightly states that the point at issue was not the necessity of wearing the same apparel that was used by the Romanists, "but the real point at issue being, and soon afterwards showing itself to be, the right principle of Church government." [Doc. Ann. vol. i. p. 321.]

It is for that reason that a survey, no matter how brief, of the contest of the Puritans against the Ordinal would be incomplete without some reference to the Advertisements. By recalling the Licenses, and examining the applicants as to their doctrine before granting fresh ones, it was hoped to silence the depravers of the Prayer Book and Ordinal.

§ VII. *The Canons of 1571.*

The Convocation of 1571 which sat between April 3 and May 30 passed a book of Canons in April. The date of April can be fixed by means of the Canon on Bishops. One of the enactments of that Canon was that all licenses should be recalled before the September following. In other words, all licenses issued before the passing of the Canon were to be considered void. Now, the Order issued by the Ecclesiastical Commissioners on June 7, 1571, in consequence of these Canons, instructs churchwardens to see that the minister "be such as is licensed to preach after the first of May last," hence the Canons must have been passed before the first of May, 1571.

The instructions of the Bishop of Ely to his Chancellor, under date of August 28, 1571, are to the same effect.

It was further ordained that all preachers having licenses to preach at any time before the last day of April last must render up the old license unto the Bishop of the Diocese, etc. [Strype's *Parker*, vol. ii. p. 61.]

Before the applicant could obtain a fresh license he had to subscribe to the XXXIX Articles of 1562 and promise to maintain and defend the doctrine in them contained, as being most agreeable to the Word of God.

Besides this clause ordering the recall of licenses so that doctrine inclining to Rome or Geneva might not be taught in the pulpit, there were two other injunctions laid on Bishops, in this Canon *De Episcopis*, which need mention.

The Bishops were not to lay hands on any that were brought up in husbandry, or some other mean trade or calling, but that all the candidates should well understand the Latin tongue, and be conversant in the Scriptures.

That they should suffer none who by an idle name called themselves readers and received not imposition of hands in the ministry of the Church.

Episcopus neminem, qui se otioso nomine lectorem vocet, et manus impositionem non acceperit, in ecclesiae ministerio versari patietur.

These provisions were aimed against the Puritans and those who denied the exclusive validity of Episcopal Ordination. The country was being filled with ignorant men who as the Archbishop had said "sought under cover of reformation the ruin and subversion both of learning and religion."

Tailors, bricklayers, and such like set themselves up as blind leaders of the blind, and justified their conduct by the text *Spiritus ubi vult spirat.**

Nor was any person to be received into the ministry of the Church in any Diocese, without dimissory letters from the Bishop of the Diocese he was leaving. This clause would not only serve the purpose of preventing excommunicated, deposed, or suspended clerics from entering a Diocese as clerks in good standing, but would enable the Bishop of the Diocese he sought to enter to ascertain not only as to the moral fitness of the applicant, but also as to his orthodoxy in doctrine, and conformity to the Prayer Book and Ordinal. What perhaps was still more important, it would be a means of discovering such men as had forged letters of Orders.

At the end of the Canon "Æditui ecclesiarum et alii selecti viri," mention is made of the celebrated *Book of Advertisements*, about which there has of late years been so considerable a discussion, and of which we made a cursory survey in the last section.

* "A bricklaer taken upon him the office of preaching, affirmed he might lawfully do it, though he were not called thereonto by ye Church." For *Spiritus ubi vult spirat*, Huggard's *Displaying of the Protestantes*, sign B. iii. as quoted by Hardwick, p. 102, note.

One of the Kentish ministers cited before Archbishop Whitgift in 1583 has against his name "no graduate, lately a tailor."

By this and other Synods, as Cardwell rightly states, the Advertisements were always considered as having the most perfect authority. The Advertisements, like these Canons of 1571, were not formally sanctioned by the Queen. When dealing with the enforced subscription to the Articles under Section IX we will recur to this apparent lack of royal sanction.

The Canons of 1571 were issued in Latin, unnumbered, but with a heading containing the subject-matter. An edition in English was also shortly put out; as, however, the Latin seems to have been the only authoritative edition, or at any rate appears to have been the only form in which they were passed by Convocation, the Canon on preachers is given in full in Latin.

CONCIONATORES.

Imprimis vero videbunt, ne quid unquam doceant pro concione quod a populo religiose teneri et credi velint, nisi quod consentaneum sit doctrinæ veteris aut novi Testamenti, quodque ex illa ipsa doctrina Catholici patres, et veteres Episcopi collegerint, et quoniam articuli illi religionis Christianæ in quos consensum est ab Episcopis in legitima et Sancta Synodo, jussa atque autoritate serenissimæ Principis Elizabethæ convocata et celebrata, haud dubie collecti sunt ex sacris libris veteris et novi Testamenti, et cum cœlesti doctrina, quæ in illis continetur, per omnia congruunt; quoniam etiam liber publicarum precum, et liber de inauguratione Archiepiscoporum, Episcoporum, Presbyterorum, et Diaconorum, nihil continent ab illâ ipsâ doctrina alienum; quicunque mittentur ad docendum populum, illorum articulorum autoritatem et fidem, non tantum concionibus suis sed etiam subscriptione confirmabunt. Qui secus fecerit, et contrariâ doctrinâ populum turbaverit excommunicabitur. [Cardwell's *Synodalia*, Oxford, 1842, vol. i. p. 126.]

Or in English:—

PREACHERS.

First, however, they shall take care not to teach anything for a sermon, which they wish the people religiously to hold and believe, except what is agreeable to the doctrine of the old, or new Testament, and which the Catholic Fathers and ancient Bishops have gathered from that very doctrine; and since these Articles of the Christian Religion, to which the Bishops agreed in a lawful and holy Synod which by command and authority of the most serene Lady Elizabeth was convoked and held, were undoubtedly gathered from the Sacred books of the old and new Testament, and agree throughout with the Heav- enly doctrine contained in those Testaments: Since, moreover, *the Book*

of Common Prayer, and the Book of the Ordination of Bishops, Priests, and Deacons contain nothing at variance with this very doctrine, whoever shall be sent to teach the people shall confirm the authority and truth of these Articles, *not only in their Sermons, but also by subscription.*

He who shall have done otherwise, and who shall have disturbed the people by contrary teaching, shall be excommunicated.

Here, again, the Canon on Preachers runs contrary to the cry of the Puritans, who maintained that the Book of Common Prayer, and especially the *Ordinal*, was contrary to the Doctrine of the Old and New Testament.

§ VIII. *Act 13 Elizabeth, c. 12.*

Under this Act, which received the Royal assent May 29, 1571, it was required that

Every one under the degree of a Bishop, which doth or shall pretend to be a priest or minister of God's holy Word and Sacraments by reason of any other form of institution, consecration, or ordering than the form set forth by Parliament in the time of the late King of most worthy memory, King Edward Sixth, or now used in the reign of our most gracious Sovereign lady, before the feast of the Nativity of CHRIST, next following, shall in the presence of the Bishop, or guardian of the spiritualities of some one Diocese, where he hath, or shall have Ecclesiastical living, declare his assent, and subscribe to all the Articles of Religion, which only concern the confession of the true Christian faith, and the Doctrine of the Sacraments comprised in a book entitled

and here follows the title of the 39 Articles of 1562.

This Act, therefore, barred Roman priests and deacons from holding a cure without first assenting to the XXXIX Articles; since the only priests, or ministers, or deacons, who could pretend to have received any form of legal institution, consecrating, or ordering, than that set forth under Edward VI or Elizabeth, were those who had been so ordained under the reign of Mary, and who of course under that reign were the *only* legal priests or ministers, or deacons.

Henceforth, then, the two side avenues to the Church's cures were barred, the Roman and the Puritan.

Even this very *Act 13 Elizabeth, c. 12*, further enacted that :

No person now permitted by any dispensation or otherwise, shall retain any Benefice with Cure, being under the age of one and twenty years, or not being a Deacon at least, and none shall be made Minis-

ter, or admitted to preach or administer the Sacraments, being under the age of twenty-four years, nor unless he bring the Bishop of the Diocese testimonial of his regular life and of his professing the Doctrine expressed in the said Articles. . . . And lastly all Admissions to Benefices, Institutions, and Inductions contrary to the form and provision of this Act, and all Toleration, Dispensations, Qualifications, and Licenses whatsoever to be made to the contrary hereof shall be void in Law.

The Puritans, who were ever on the watch how to avoid sanctioning the Ordinal, seized hold on one word in the first part of this Act, the word *only*, and under cover of that word refused to sign the XXXIX Articles. Their plea was that they had only to sign those Articles "which only concern the true Christian faith and the Doctrine of the Sacraments," and that therefore by this limitation all of the XXXIX Articles which related to the Homilies (which they detested owing to their strong doctrine), to the Ordinal, and to the Authority of the Church, were not to be included in the Articles presented them for their subscription. [Collier, p. 530.]

The word "only" in the text of the Act, of course referred to all the Articles, and was used in an apologetic or explanatory sense of the contents of the whole of these Articles; and was in that first section of the Act, which, as we have seen, was aimed at the Roman Catholics. It was as much as to say, "We do not want you to declare your Orders to be invalid, or to make any other confession of faith in signing these XXXIX Articles, for, after all, they only contain a Confession of the Christian Faith, and the Doctrine of the Holy Sacraments."

By raising a quibble as to the meaning of the word "only," and maintaining that the law did not require them to do so, the Puritans refused to subscribe to all the XXXIX Articles, thus appealing from one Act to another Act.

As a conclusion to these remarks on this statute the words of Sir Edward Coke, as quoted by Collier [p. 530], are singularly appropriate.

And that this (*i. e.* Subscription to all the Articles without exception) was the meaning of the Legislature is further made good by Sir Edward Coke's authority, who positively affirms, That the Subscriptions required by the Clergy takes in all the Nine and thirty Articles. And that by this Statute the Delinquent is disabled and deprived, *ipso facto*. He adds further: —

"That when one Smith subscribed the Nine and thirty Articles with this addition (so far forth as the same were agreeable to the word of GOD) 't was resolved by Sir Christopher Wray, Chief Justice in the King's Bench, and all the Judges of England, that this subscription was not according to the Statute of 13 Elizabeth, cap. 12." [Coke's *Reports*, liber 6, fol. 29, Green's case.]

Because the Statute required an absolute Subscription, whereas this Subscription made it conditional. And further, this Act was made for avoiding Diversity of Opinions, &c. But by this qualification or addition, the party might by his own private opinion take some of the Articles to be against the Word of GOD; and so by this means diversity of opinions would not be avoided. And thus the scope of the Statute and the very Act itself made touching Subscription would be of none effect. Thus far Sir Edward Coke. [*Institutes*, part iv. fol. 323, 324.]

From the days of Elizabeth to those of Victoria the Puritans have always, possibly owing to what Archbishop Parker called their "Germanical natures," shown a singularly convenient inability to understand plain English.

ARTHUR LOWNDES.

THE CHURCH IN THE WEST.

Our Country: Its Possible Future and Its Present Crisis. By Rev. JOSIAH STRONG, D. D. With an Introduction by Professor AUSTIN PHELPS, D. D. Fortieth Thousand. New York: Baker & Taylor Co. 1886.

In this startling book, the Rev. Dr. Strong presents an array of facts and statistics worthy of the most serious consideration of every lover of his country. One reads some of his statements with a disposition to incredulity, and perhaps his enthusiasm has led him to draw inferences, sometimes, that are scarcely warranted; but in the main his position is established by official figures and sound argument. It is purposed to use some of his conclusions as a partial basis for this article, and it is hoped that they will not only serve this purpose, but that such use of them will lead to a wider reading and a deeper study of this timely book.

In the first chapter the author shows the late beginning and rapid strides of modern progress; in the second he deals with the vast resources of the United States; and in the third he treats of "Western Supremacy." The title of this last is sufficiently astonishing, but its contents are much more so. Near the end of it he speaks as follows: —

Beyond a peradventure the West is to dominate the East. With more than twice the room and resources of the East, the West will have probably twice the population and wealth of the East, together with the superior power and influence which, under popular government, accompany them. The West will elect the Executive and control legislation. . . . The West will direct the policy of the government, and by virtue of her preponderating population and influence will determine our national character and, therefore, destiny.

In chapters IV to X the perils to which the nation is exposed are graphically set forth. They are enumerated as Immigration, Romanism, Mormonism, Intemperance, Socialism, Wealth, and The City.

In chapter XI, speaking of these in relation to the West, he says : —

We have already seen that the West is peculiarly exposed to the dangers of Mormonism, materialism, luxuriousness, and the centralisation of wealth ; that conditions are exceptionally favorable to the spread of socialism ; that the relative power of the saloon is two and a half times greater in the far West than in the East ; that Mormonism is rapidly growing ; that Romanism, as compared with the population, is about three times as strong in the Territories as in the whole United States ; and that into the West is pouring seventy-five per cent. of the immigration.

Treating of the influence of early settlers, in this same chapter, he shows from certain examples how long continued and powerful it is ; and after enumerating the evil powers now at work to determine the character of the new West, he gives a statement from Dr. Dorchester [*Problem of Religious Progress*] of the strength of the opposing force, as embodied in the non-Roman Christian communions.

The evangelical church membership of the United States in 1880 was one fifth of the entire population ; but in Oregon, the same year, only one in eleven of the population was in some evangelical church ; in Dakota, one in twelve ; in Washington, one in sixteen ; in California and Colorado, one in twenty ; in Idaho, one in thirty-three ; in Montana, one in thirty-six ; in Nevada, one in forty-six ; in Wyoming, one in eighty-one ; in Utah, one in two hundred and twenty-four ; in New Mexico, one in six hundred and fifty-seven ; in Arizona, one in six hundred and eighty-five.

Chapter XII treats of "The Exhaustion of the Public Lands," and demonstrates that these lands are being so rapidly taken up that all of value for farming will be taken before the close of this century. It is also shown that, on account of the way in which settlement is being made, the people congregating largely in cities and towns first, "the character of the West will be substantially determined some time before the land is all occupied." Then, referring to the stamping of the impress of early settlers upon communities, as before exemplified, the author concludes that "this abiding stamp is to be given to the West in the course of the *next fifteen or twenty years.*" He then sums up the question with this vivid illustration : —

Suppose all of Western Europe were practically uninhabited, that

to-day the pioneer were pitching his tent by the Thames and the Seine, and building his log cabin on the banks of the Tiber. He takes with him, not the rude implements of centuries ago, but the locomotive, the telegraph, the steam-press, and all the swift appliances of modern civilisation. Suppose the countries above named (Great Britain, France, Spain, Italy, Austria, Germany, Norway, and Sweden, together with a dozen of the smaller European states) were all to be settled in twenty years ; that, instead of the slow evolutions of many centuries, their political, social, religious, and educational institutions were to be determined by one generation ; that from this one generation were to spring a civilisation, like Minerva from the head of Jupiter, full-grown and fully equipped. What a period in the world's history it would be, unparalleled and tremendous ! Yet, such a Europe is being created by this generation west of the Mississippi. And within the bosom of these few years is folded not only the future of the mighty West, but the nation's destiny ; for, as we have seen, the West is to dominate the East.

Not content with this, he goes on, in another chapter, to reason that the destiny of the whole human race is bound up with that of the Anglo-Saxon ; and, having determined this question, he concludes : —

Let us weld together in a chain the various links of our logic which we have endeavored to forge. Is it manifest that the Anglo-Saxon holds in his hands the destinies of mankind for ages to come ? Is it evident that the United States is to be the home of this race, the principal seat of his power, the great centre of his influence ? Is it true that the great West is to dominate the nation's future ? Has it been shown that this generation is to determine the character, and hence the destiny, of the West ? Then may GOD open the eyes of this generation !

In this prayer we all may heartily join, for if these things are even approximately true, a tremendous responsibility rests upon the Church to-day.

Now that an estimate may be formed of the fitness of our own Church for this conflict, and of the prospect before her, resort must be had to statistics from other sources.

It may be proper to say here, however, that there is neither desire nor intention to ignore or belittle the work of other Christian bodies in the West. As sincere lovers of our LORD JESUS CHRIST and earnest laborers for Him, they are fellow-workers with us, and will do, during these crucial years, good and faithful service, whatever their more distant future may be.

This does not apply to Romanism, of course, which has justly been classed among the public enemies.

According to the census of 1880, the population east of the Mississippi (Louisiana is counted as east, and Minnesota as west of that river, and Alaska is ignored, in this paper) was forty-one million four hundred and sixty thousand nine hundred and ninety-four, an increase in the preceding decade of twenty-three and a quarter per cent.; whilst that west of the river was eight million six hundred and ninety-four thousand seven hundred and eighty-nine, an increase, for the same period, of nearly seventy-seven per cent., or more than three times greater than that of the East.

The journal of the General Convention of 1880 reports the number of communicants in the East as three hundred and sixteen thousand two hundred and ninety-three, or one to each one hundred and thirty-one of the population; and in the West as twenty-seven thousand seven hundred and forty-one, or one to each three hundred and seventeen of the population.

The number of clergy in the East was two thousand nine hundred and five, or one to each fourteen thousand two hundred and seventy-two of the population, and to each one hundred and nine communicants. In the West the clergy numbered four hundred and fourteen, or one to each twenty-one thousand and two of the population, and to each sixty-seven communicants.

Assuming that the population increased in the same ratio for the next six years, the number of people in the East at the close of last year was over forty-seven and a quarter million, and in the West twelve and three quarter million.

The journal of the late General Convention reports three hundred and seventy-nine thousand two hundred and thirty-one communicants in the East, and forty-four thousand and forty-nine in the West; whilst the number of clergy is respectively three thousand two hundred and ten, and five hundred and three.

The increase in population is thus nearly fourteen per cent. in the East against about forty-six in the West. In communicants it is nearly twenty per cent. in the East against nearly fifty-nine in the West. In clergy it is ten and a half per cent. in the East against twenty-two in the West.

Thus it will be seen that whilst the West is gaining in com-

municants about three times as fast as the East, in clergy it is gaining only a little more than twice as fast.

And in relation to the increase in population, while the gain in communicants is one fourth greater, that in clergy is not quite half so great.

In 1880 there was in the East one communicant to each one hundred and thirty-one of the population, while now there is one to each one hundred and twenty-four and a half, which is a slight gain. In the West there was one to each three hundred and seventeen, and now there is one to each two hundred and eighty-eight and a half, a greater gain still.

The clergy show a loss both East and West, there being in the East, in 1880, one to each fourteen thousand two hundred and seventy-two of the population, while now there is one to each fourteen thousand seven hundred and seventeen. In the West there was one to each twenty-one thousand and two, but now there is one to each twenty-five thousand two hundred and fifty-seven.

The proportion of clergy to communicants is now, in the East, one to each one hundred and fifteen, and in the West one to each eighty-seven and a half. This is a small loss in the East, and a much greater in the West.

These figures show that in communicants we are gaining very slowly on the population, more slowly in the East than in the West, and that in clergy we are steadily losing in both, and especially in the West. When it is considered how small a percentage of the population we are, it will readily be seen that unless our growth is much more rapid in the future than it has been in the past, we shall not count for much in the nation a generation hence.

Should the rate of increase in population remain as it was between 1870 and 1880, in the sections respectively, the West would have a majority by 1925. It can scarcely be questioned, however, that the rate has changed and will continue to change in favor of the West. The immigration from the Old World shows every indication of continuance, and the probabilities now seem to be that it will be largely increased. It is thought that this year will witness the largest immigration that has ever come in one year to our shores. Of this stream of foreigners fully seventy-five per cent. goes to the West. Adding this to the steady and ever-growing tide of population flowing west-

ward from our own East, it will not seem unreasonable to expect that by 1920, if not sooner, a majority of the people of the United States will cast their votes west of the Mississippi.

Of the foreign immigration a very small proportion will be in communion with us, and of the influx from our Eastern States we can count only a small percentage. *Should the rate of increase continue as it is, we shall have about two and a half per cent. of the people of the West in our force of communicants in 1920, and our clergy will number one to each fifteen hundred communicants and to each seventy-two thousand of the population.*

Of course, it may be assumed, and it is certainly devoutly to be hoped, that time will bring forth for us much better things than these; but any reasonable estimate of probabilities will still leave the outlook exceedingly dark. To bring us to anything like a commanding position in the West of the next generation, there must be a rise to a rate of increase many times higher than any we have ever yet reached.

Whilst fully recognising the importance of our work in the East (for increase there means increased help to the West, in every way), we are forced by the prospect before us to see and appreciate the far greater importance of the work in the West; and there is one evident fact, which, as Dr. Strong intimates, makes the latter of much greater *urgency* than the former. In the East the population is, in the main, settled and fixed. It received an impress long ago, which still distinguishes it, and it will change but slowly. But in the West the population is in a plastic condition. People coming West break loose from old associations and influences, and become more accessible to new ideas. Hence the opportunity for accomplishing large results in a limited time are almost infinitely greater in the West than in the East. The latter may be likened to a marble block, which can be brought to a desired form only by the slow operation of the sculptor's chisel; while the former is more like the lump of clay, which yields readily to the moulder's hand.

What a call is this to the Church to be up and doing for her Master and the souls of men! It should meet with ready and hearty response. This Church of ours has an authority and a power, as well as a responsibility in the premises such as none other has or can have; and she has the ability, humanly speaking, to do the work single-handed, if she can only be induced to recognise and exercise it.

Given the Divine Spirit, the instruments needed are men, women, and money. That there are hundreds of laymen among us who could do good work in this connection, who can doubt? When one thinks of the number of intelligent men who are teaching our Bible classes, working in our Sunday schools, and doing other kinds of valuable service, and then adds the many others who are capable of doing just as well could they only be waked up to a proper sense of their responsibilities and capabilities, it is plain that *men* are not lacking.

Again, that the Church possesses a number of faithful women who are doing good work in many ways is evidence that there is a vastly greater host able to do similar work were the way open and the call seen to be imperative.

The chief difficulty, apart from the spiritual one, in making use of our men and women, is the lack of money to support them. Yet, that there is in the hands of our people money enough to supply every demand, needs no proof. Many rich men who are now giving thousands could give tens, or, in some cases, hundreds of thousands. Very many, of more moderate wealth, who now give hundreds, could give thousands or tens of thousands. To put it briefly, at least nine tenths of all our givers could increase their offerings from one to a thousand fold and be happier and better for it. Would that each one of them would read and study Dr. Strong's concluding chapter, "Money and the Kingdom," and take home to himself or herself due share of the shame which the writer shows belongs to the professed Christian people of this land. This chapter is a powerful setting forth of the true principle of Christian giving, and a terrific arraignment of CHRIST's people for the unfaithfulness of their stewardship. The *second* great need of the hour is the recognition and practical operation of this principle.

Assuming, then, that this Church of ours is in possession of the three instruments needed, — men, women, and money, — what is yet lacking?

Simply a motive strong enough to secure their utilisation. The love of CHRIST constraining us, we can do, single-handed, all that is possible to be done; we can present Him in every city, town, hamlet, settlement, and to every soul of man in this land, as the one only Saviour and LORD of men. Beyond this we are not responsible. If men will not hear they must take

the consequences, and we shall be innocent. But that they shall have opportunity to hear, it is the special mission of the Church to provide.

Here is another ground of more urgent claim for the work in the West. In the East, speaking generally, the people can hear the Gospel and have some kind of Christian ministrations, if they will; but this is not true of many thousands of people in the West. Over the plains and among the mountains are scattered thousands of families who have no opportunity, from year's end to year's end, to attend any kind of public worship. The LORD's day is to them as all other days. The influence of old associations and habits is gone, or rapidly going. The people are becoming more and more absorbed in things temporal, more and more oblivious to things eternal. The children are growing up without any kind of religious instruction. How long will it take to make this class heathens?

Here are some plain statements of fact:

Being detained at D——, I got a horse and rode out nine miles to see a family I had visited in this place some time before. At their house I found a neighbor's daughter who told me her family were Episcopalians. I went to see them, and was touched with the warmth of my welcome. They had been living here two years, and I was the first minister of any name who had visited them. No religious service had ever been held in their neighborhood.

Again:

I recently travelled five hundred and seven miles by rail and twenty-five by buck-board to get to a mountain ranch for the celebration of a marriage. On this journey, I passed four towns with populations of from four to seven thousand; six others with from several hundred to over a thousand each; a number of smaller places; and through a country which, for a good part of the distance, was what we call pretty well settled. Yet in all this country, and for a hundred and fifty miles farther, there are only three of our clergy at work. Of these, one gives all his time to one place, another is trying to minister to a field twice as large as the State of Massachusetts, and the third is the bishop of two territories.

From Topeka, Kansas, to Salt Lake City, Utah, is twelve hundred and fifty miles. The line of the Atchison, Topeka and Santa Fé Railroad to Pueblo, Colorado, runs through some twenty-five towns, and a country, for the most part, quite well settled; and from Pueblo to Salt Lake, on the line of the

Denver and Rio Grande Railroad, there are seven or eight important towns, and a number of settlements. In all this distance, to speak for this Church of ours to all these people, there are only five clergy, two of them being at Pueblo, which is a place of twenty thousand inhabitants. Regular services are held in ten or twelve places only, and even this is a new thing. The greater number of places have no service at all, except when visited by a bishop, which is not as often as once a year. In a good many of the smaller towns there is no regular service of any description, to say nothing of the country settlements.

Should a line be drawn from British America to the Gulf of Mexico, through the best settled parts of the country west of Topeka, taking lines of railroad as far as possible, the conditions would be found no better, but probably worse, considering population and distance.

It is true that a large proportion of the people of the West are in towns and cities, where they are more easily accessible, and where they have, in most cases, opportunity to hear the Gospel; but in a large majority of these this Church has no minister. Where we have men at work we are not, usually, fulfilling the requirements of the field. For instance, in Denver, a city of seventy thousand people, we have only five men in regular work. Pueblo has been referred to above. Our means are too limited to enable us to really occupy the ground we claim, yet in such cities as those above mentioned we need to exert ourselves to the uttermost. It is in them that most of the perils are at their maximum, and in them we can reach the most people with the least expenditure of force. We need for this work men and women who will devote themselves, for the love of CHRIST, to carrying the Gospel and the ministrations of the Church into the slums and the evil quarters generally, till no man, no woman shall be able, with reason, to say: "No man careteth for my soul."

As we look over the past of the Church's history, we see her at first composed of a little handful of the most despised of a despised people, going forth with a sublime faith and courage to do battle with the powers of evil entrenched in the institutions, the customs, and the affections of all the nations of the world. About a century and a half after the work was begun among the Gentiles, Tertullian could boldly claim a majority for the Christians in the Roman empire.

Again, as that empire in its period of decay was overrun by the wild heathen of the North, we see the Church, notwithstanding her loss of spiritual power through her unfortunate alliance with the world, in the very face of destruction wresting victory from death and Satan, and leavening that unsavory lump of pagan humanity with the religion of JESUS CHRIST, though not in its primitive purity.

Still later, when, after ages of ignorance and superstition, the Church of England threw off the incubus, and returned to the primitive faith and practice, renewed evidence of vitality and power was given.

If we look back one hundred years and see what that Church and her children have brought forth, we thrill with the grandeur of the spectacle; and we feel that nothing is too hard for the Church of JESUS CHRIST when she has a mind to work, but that she can do wonderful things through Him who strengthens her.

With all this in mind, we may turn our eyes to the great battle now being fought in our own West, with all faith and confidence. We gaze upon a field which has never been surpassed, if equalled, in importance, in the possibilities of its outcome, in the good or evil that must flow from its results. Here we have the various races of the sons of Adam, after a separation which has sufficed to differentiate them into several distinct and widely varying families, coming together again for fusion into a homogeneous people. As this gathering goes on before our eyes, we cannot but ask what is to be the character of this new evolution. We see great possibilities, great dangers, and we recognise an evident and imperative appeal to us to step forward and bend ourselves to a mighty effort to win and to hold this race of the future for the LORD JESUS CHRIST. All the forces of Satan are drawn up in battle array on this field, bent on the subjection of this, the latest and greatest of the nations, to his sway. With fiendish malice, consummate art, and desperate zeal and energy he is striving to blot out the image of God in this coming man, and to bring him down to the level of beast or demon.

Who can look upon the scene and not feel his pulses throb faster, his blood course more vigorously through his veins, his courage rise to battle pitch, his hatred of evil flash out with renewed intensity, his loyalty to his Master burn with deeper

fire, and his love for his fellow-men determine him to devote himself, all he is and all he has, to the defeat of that accursed host and the winning of that field for the LORD and His CHRIST?

What battle could be juster, nobler, holier than this? If we leap to the forefront of war to defend the honor, the integrity, the liberty of the nation, how much more eagerly should we bound to the place of danger in this war for CHRIST, His Kingdom, and our brethren! If we peril our lives to protect the weak, the innocent, the helpless from the oppressor who would subject them to wrong, how much more should we rush to the rescue of this intended victim of the great enemy of our race!

A glance at Northern Africa, where the Church was once powerful, and another at those countries whose spiritual life has sickened and wasted under the blight of vaticanism, brings fearful warning to the Church in these United States; and bids us be very humble, very prayerful, and very zealous in good works, in view of the possibility of a like fate should we prove unfaithful.

Is any one now moved to ask, What can I do?

If the question be asked seriously, with a sincere desire and an earnest determination to do the duty of the hour, perhaps an answer, or at least a hint that may lead to an answer, may be found in what follows.

What is to hinder you from offering *yourself* for active service in the forefront of the great battle in the West? Personal service is by far the most real and most valuable. Had we ever so much money we could not utilise it without workers. When the infant Church began her career she had little or no money, but she was rich in earnest men and women, who gave *themselves* for the work. This is the *first*, the *greatest* need to-day. First and foremost, then, *give yourself*, if you possibly can, to this work. And do not let mere earthly or worldly obstacles hinder. Ask yourself, on your knees before God, whether you cannot and ought not to forsake all worldly ease, comfort, advantage,—to empty yourself, in short, as fully as the Eternal Son emptied Himself for your sake,—that you may be able to devote yourself to the highest service to Him and to your fellow-men.

If you be a man, and not already a minister, the ministry

may be open to you ; or if you are not competent for the holy office, you may become a lay-helper of the ministry. The restricted diaconate, however, offers a place in the ministry to which any intelligent layman, being otherwise fit, may find admittance.

If you be a woman, there is place and work for you in appropriate spheres, where you may do noble and effective service.

If you have sufficient means of your own, you will not be troubled about provision for your daily needs ; but may go forth at your own charges, and so be doubly privileged.

Should you be obliged reluctantly to decide that you cannot give *yourself* to this work, then give everything else you can. Are you rich ? Remember Him who for your sake became poor. You may provide for the support of some who can give themselves but have nothing else to give, and who without your aid could not go or be sent. You may enable them to labor without care for food and raiment. You may provide buildings, furniture, books, modes of travel, etc., etc. And remember that "he gives twice who gives quickly," and that in this crucial time hundreds will be worth more than thousands a few years later. Remember, too, the rich young man spoken of in the Gospel [*S. Matthew xix.*], and do not forget Dives.

Are you poor ? Do what you can. You can at least bear this good work in your heart before God. You can pray for it and talk for it. "She hath done what she could," is as great praise as can be given to any one.

Does somebody say to all this, It is a large demand ? Not *too* large. Do not men give themselves, their children, their property, to their country in the hour of its peril ? Is it asking too much of the citizen of the Kingdom of Heaven to do for it as much as he is ready to do for the kingdom of his earthly citizenship ? Surely not. Then in this case the demand is from *both* kingdoms, the heavenly and the earthly. Both Church and country are in danger here, and they unite their voices in this appeal to you, Christian and citizen.

And not only so. All the nations of the earth lift up their voices in supplication, the generations yet unborn plead with mute but eloquent helplessness, that we of this generation shall rise to the height of our responsibility, our opportunity, our privilege, and do our duty in this day so pregnant with good or evil for the future.

Let us place the situation, then, fairly before us. Here in the West is now being fought a battle second in importance to none in the world's history. It may be the final battle in this world for CHRIST and humanity. It must in any case be a battle whose result shall be an influence for good or for evil beyond our power to forecast. The time is short. The call is imperative. Whether or no this battle shall be *won* for CHRIST we cannot tell; but that it shall be well and determinedly *fought* for Him it is our duty, our one, preëminent, supreme duty, to see.

HENRY FORRESTER.

LIFE, TIMES, AND CORRESPONDENCE OF BISHOP WHITE.

CHAPTER VI. (*Continued*).—THE MEETING IN NEW YORK, OCTOBER, 1784.

ON the day following that on which Mr. Parker wrote, the Rev. Dr. Smith addressed the following characteristic letter to his former pupil. It is needless to say that the scheme of a State University for Maryland inspired by the gifted man failed, as did so many of his projects, of successful issue.

REV^D. SIR,—A namesake, and (as he writes me) a Relation,* desires me to address him under cover to you, and I must beg, therefore, your particular care of the enclosed ; and if he is not in Philad^A, be pleased to send me a few lines by return of the Post. I would have answered his letter sooner if it had come to my hand, but I received it only to-day on my return from Annapolis, where I have been for six weeks past. The Business in which I have been engaged, you are without doubt informed of. The great and liberal minds of the Governor, Mr. Chase, and others, added to their influence and zeal for the interests of Religion and Learning, have brought about some Legislative Establishments during the sitting of the General Assembly which will do lasting honor to the State of Maryland. The enclosed address of the General Assembly will give you some account of what has been done as well as what more will be attempted to be done in the Long Sessions of Assembly. There is considerable opposition to the Religious Bill, from some men who call themselves Christians, but I need not tell you seem never to be pleased with anything, however Christian or however Catholic, where their numbers will not enable them to be the *sole* or *chief* directors. Whether anything will be done upon the principles of the Bill for the support of Religion will depend upon the instructions to be given in the several counties during the Recess of the Assembly which is to meet again the 28th of March. Great zeal will be employed by the opponents of that Bill, for

* The Rev. William Smith, subsequently of Newport, R. I., and later of Norwalk, Conn. This excellent man was the compiler of *The Induction or Instituting Office*, and was a man of great learning and ability.

Baltimore and our Friend *Allison*, with as many of the different anti-Episcopal denominations as he can unite, have already begun. And those who wish for the Bill, and who are certainly the far greater Number, will probably be as indolent as usual, and leave the Burden on a few. Should that be the case, it will be a desertion of their friends in the Assembly, who are the friends of Religion on the most liberal Principles, namely, those of the Constitution, and it may be long before they have another opportunity of doing that which good men in general wish for the sake of society. Indeed they will deserve no future opportunity if they are either negligent or afraid to speak their sentiments, when thus solemnly called upon by their Delegates to *speak without reserve*. The Laity are the Body called upon, and our Clergy have thought it unbecoming to take any part particularly *active*, lest it should be thought that they wish particular *Favors*, whereas they have never had such a wish, and the Bill gives the strongest possible evidence to the contrary. It was for this reason that we agreed, at our last meeting, neither to petition nor to be present as solicitors; but to leave it wholly to the Legislature. My being at Annapolis was not intentional for this business, as we did not expect it to be taken up this Session. A Committee of us only were there to obtain the Incorporating Act of our Clergy for a Widows' Fund, etc., which has passed the Legislature. I was then called in conjunction with two clergymen of other Denominations, Rev. Mr. Carroll and Dr. Allison, to draft the *University Law*; which we happily did with great unanimity, altho' Dr. Allison, it is said, gives it but very faint encouragement now that it has passed. Of this, however, I am not certain, and would fain hope it may not be true, as he had not an objection left to the Bill, and no alteration has been made in its passage thro' the Assembly. Maryland has been among the last of the States in her provisions for Learning; but none of them can boast so noble a Foundation as her University now is. Enclosed are the original Proposals. The same six agents are to carry the scheme into Execution till thirteen visitors are chosen. Under the Proposals, you will find a sketch of the Constitution of the University.

I observe in Bailey's last Paper, something from the Party I have so often in this letter had in View respecting your *new Academy*. It is insolent to the highest degree, nay, threatens such a persecution, and such an arbitrary, unconstitutional right in the Legislature to dictate in matters of Religion, Learning, and Conscience, that you will surely not let it pass. Not content with robbing the old College, and taking what they had never earned to their own use, the Party claims an exclusive right to all direction of literature within the State, and after taking from us what we had before, threatens to take everything you may hereafter apply to the like purpose. No *toleration*. Yet I

cannot wholly approve your *Episcopal Academy*; — so far as I understand the design that you have a right to such an Institution, and that the gentlemen concerned will have their children better educated than in the University, I have no doubt. But I did not wish to see our old College rights so soon or so easily deserted. Why did not the old Trustees set up this Institution on their own footing, keeping up their claim to their Buildings and Estates, and filling up their number with the same additional persons, viz: Mr. Markoe, etc., upon the recommendation of the subscribers? Or may not this yet be done? I have not time yet to digest my thoughts on this Head, and this whole Letter is so incoherent and hastily done that I *beg* you will keep it wholly to yourself. The Bearer of it, Mr. Drinker, is just ready to set out for Philad^a.

The enclosed *Resolves*, the *Address* of the Assembly, the *Bill*, and the *Paper* that follows, just as they stand on the printed halfsheet, I would request you to get Mr. Hall and Mr. Bradford to put in their Newspapers, without dividing them into separate Publications, for their papers are what circulate chiefly on our shore. I hope Mr. Drinker will deliver this carefully.

Yours, etc.

WM. SMITH.

CHESTER IN MARYLAND, January 26th, 1785.

REV. DR. WHITE.

N. B. The Act for the Support of Religion in Virginia is similar to that for Maryland, and is referred over in the same [way] to the consideration of the people, and was opposed in the House by the same Parties as in Maryland.*

The letter from Mr. Duché which we have given, dispatched in haste so as to give Dr. White the earliest intelligence possible concerning the consecration in Scotland, was followed, agreeably to promise, by another, written on the receipt in England of the proceedings of the Convention in New York.

ASYLUM, LAMBETH, Feb. 10th, 1785.

MY DEAR SIR,— Your Conclusions at N. York, I must tell you plainly are quite inconsistent with the Discipline of the Church of England, which you profess to make your Model, so far as she may be supposed unconnected with any Civil Power. They are also inconsistent with that Form of Ecclesiastical Discipline, which prevailed in the purest period of the Christian Church. They seem to be wholly formed upon ye Presbyterian Model, and calculated to introduce the same Kind of Government in the Church, that is established in your State. Whereas the State, according to their own acknowledgment will have nothing to do in Church Matters. You have it therefore in

* From the Bishop White MSS.

your [power] to form a Church perfectly primitive, and absolutely uncontrouled by any Civil Power, so far as its Laws do not interfere with those of the State.

Judge then with what Astonishment every true Episcopalian must view your Treatment of the Episcopal Order, by declaring, as you have done, that they shall have no distinction at your Conventions, but only be considered as Members, ex officio. I consider this as fundamentally wrong. An Episcopal Clergyman cannot confound the Orders of Bishop and Priest, and withhold his Assent from due Subordination.

These and other Matters, I hope, will be properly cleared up and settled on the Arrival of Bishop Seabury, who sails for N. York some time during the present Month. He is a truly primitive Bishop, consecrated by three Bishops in Scotland, where the Apostolical Succession has been inviolably preserved, as appears from the Register he takes with him. He has taken no Oath of any kind to any Power on Earth, and therefore comes to you in "unquestionable Form;" just such a Bishop as you could have wished for, and such as you could by no other means have obtained. Receive him, therefore, I beseech you, with Cordial Affection, and with that Christian Respect which is due to his high and sacred Office. Suffer no Schism in y^e Church. Providence has sent him to accomplish and preserve a compleat Union in your new American Episcopal Church. His Consecration, you know, cannot be approved of here, for Reasons obvious to those who know the Connection of the Church with the State. I, therefore, could not ask him to officiate for me, neither would he for prudential and proper Reasons. He considers himself, and must be considered here, as a foreign Bishop. God grant that you may all be kept in y^e Unity of the Spirit, and y^e Bond of Peace.

By Capt. Willett you will receive a Box of Books directed for you, containing two vols. of Chambers' Dictionary and Turrelini's Compendium Theologiae, which by mistake were supposed to be mine, and packed up with my Books by some of my friends; but which really belong to your Church Library. The other books are directed to Mrs. Hopkinson, which I must beg the favour of you to deliver, together with a Packet for Mr. John David, Silversmith, in Front street.

I am sorry to hear so much of Party Commotions and Private Distresses from Philad. Where Discord once makes a Breach into the peace of a state, Love flies thro' it, and does not readily return. I thank sincerely the good Providence of my God for my present happy Asylum. Adieu. My Father is in high health and spirits, and says he never lived so happy. Mrs. Duché and my young folk well, and all join in love to you and yours, with

Your affectionate Friend and Serv^t, J. DUCHÉ.
N. B. — This Letter is for your private use, and not to be shown.

Subsequent letters from this source indicate that the writer in his criticisms and suggestions reflected not only his own views, but also those of the friends of the American Church in England occupying high positions in Church and State. Not unfrequently the Archbishop availed himself of Mr. Duché's ready pen to indicate to Dr. White views and sentiments shared in by the leading Bishops on the bench.

Another letter from Mr. Wharton gives interesting glimpses of the men and measures of the day and serves to reveal the strong hold its writer had secured on the affection and regard of White.

WILMINGTON, April 11, '85.

MY DEAR SIR, — I was just getting on my horse for a morning's ride to this place when your favour was delivered me. You are at full liberty to alter the reference to the New York Physician, and I should take it very kind if you would make any other corrections which you may judge necessary. I believe the Latin quotation is properly translated. The apparent deficiency in point of perspicuity arises from the chasm in the manuscript, where the most material part of the sentence is evidently omitted with design. You will observe that it was to point out this unfair dealing that the passage was quoted.

It gives me sincere pleasure to find that the Academy* goes on so

* The steps taken in founding the Episcopal Academy are thus detailed by Bp. White, in a paper drawn up in 1816 : — "By ye design or ye Institution originated with yr writer of this narrative, he ought not to be backward to declare that he was induced to it by ye opinion of ye expediency of every religious society's being possessed of a Seminary, in which their youth, at least in ye early stages of their education, may be instructed in ye principles of religion, agreeably to ye views entertained by ye society in question. Under existing circumstances, a more extensive plan than that of preparation for a collegiate education, was evidently not to be accomplished.

For ye establishment of a Seminary of an inferior grade, ye crisis was peculiarly favourable, on account of ye unjust and unconstitutional Act of ye legislature, in ye invasion of ye chartered rights of ye college, Academy, and charitable schools of ye city of Philadelphia ; which had occasioned dissatisfaction in ye minds of a great proportion of ye citizens, and especially those of ye Episcopal Church ; ye members whereof had contributed more than those of any other communion to ye establishment and ye support of ye Seminary.*

With a view to an institution of a more humble kind, subscriptions were solicited and obtained in ye latter end of ye year 1784.

On ye first of Januay in ye following year, ye subscribers assembled in Christ

* It is not designed to insinuate that there was anything in ye constitution, or in ye engagements of ye old College, giving a preference to ye Episcopal Church. — It had been carried on from ye beginning on a different principle. It was generally supposed that ye instituting of ye academy had a considerable effect on ye restoration of ye College.

well. May it advance proportionally to the zeal and pure intentions of its worthy promoters. I suppose Dr. Smith showed you Mr. Parker's letter from Boston. I was sorry to find from it "between you and me" that so valuable a man is imbued to such a degree with the principles of Toryism. It is painful also to learn that the Arian and Socinian ideas are so prevalent to the Northward. My vote shall never go to countenance the slightest alteration of the liturgy with a view of favouring doctrines of that nature. I should be much obliged to you if you would desire Aitken to bind me up in one volume, the Letter, Mr. C.'s Address, and the Reply, as soon as the latter shall be finished. You will do me the favour of applying to Cist for any number of copies you may chuse for yourself. You saw, I suppose, Dr. Griffith's very excellent letter to Dr. Smith upon the proceedings in Virginia relative to the Church. A certain set of designers must feel very small upon the total overthrow of their elysian ideas. I have no doubt but in that State and Maryland we shall make a more respectable figure than ever. The appearance of Mr. Andrew's accepting your offer relieves me from a state of suspense, that is very disagreeable. All things considered I believe it better for all parties that matters should be as they are. With kind compliments to Mrs. W. and family, I remain, D^r S^r Your affectionate

B^r and obedient humble servant,

C. WHARTON.

Turning from these notices of the beginnings of an Institution still standing as a monument of the wisdom and far-sighted policy of its founder, we may not omit the interesting correspondence prefacing the meeting of the Philadelphia Convention of the Church in the Middle and Southern States appointed at the session in New York for Michaelmas, 1785. We give from the Bishop Parker MSS., in the collection of the writer, a letter addressed to Mr. Parker by Dr. White. To this letter of Dr. White's there is no date appended; but the original is endorsed as having been received in June, 1785.

Church, agreed on ye fundamental laws. The sums subscribed and paid, including all subsequent contributions, amounted to £4.214. 7s. 11d.

On ye fourth of April following, there were opened a Latin, a mathematical, and an English school. The site was a building on ye back part of a lot ye East side of Fourth Street, a few feet south of Market Street; before used as a private seminary, and still existing, but concealed from view by houses built on ye front of ye lot. At ye time of opening, ye principal had not been chosen. But on ye 21st of April, ye Rev. Dr. John Andrews of Maryland was elected to ye place; and shortly after took possession of it.

From this beginning, after many vicissitudes, and by slow degrees, this noble institution has attained its present strength and position. Its proudest boast will ever be that it was founded by William White.

DEAR SIR,— I should have answered your last Favor sooner, but for my Desire of furnishing you at ye same Time with an Acc't of our Proceedings in Consequence of ye Measures taken in N. York. I am sorry to find that those Measures have been so construed by some of our Friends in England, as if we had refused to ye Ep'l Order ye Right of Precedency in our Conventions. Probably you will recollect, that in ye original Draft it was provided that ye senior Bp: present sh'd preside ; and that this was erased, not from ye Idea that any other than a Bp ought to be Presid't, but from an Observation of Dr. S. that to restrain it to ye Senior Bp. might be sometimes inconvenient ; I wish that ye Clause had stood.

We have no information of Bishop Seabury's Arrival at N. London or in any Part of ye U. States ; I hope we may expect him at ye Meeting in Sep'r. The Papers mention ye Consecration of a Dr. M. Moffat for Rhode-Island, but they are ye only Channel by which we have even heard ye Name of that Gentleman.

I suppose you have had nothing further from ye Blockhead who wrote under ye Signature of "A Presbyterian." In ye present State of Affairs, ye Appearance of such an intolerant Spirit will rather have a Tendency to assist us.

The intended Academy of which I informed you has been opened about two months. The Schools contain 125 Boys and are continually increasing. We have elected for Principal Mr. Andrews of Maryl'd, a worthy Clergyman of our Church, whom we daily expect to take ye Charge of it. . . .

Perhaps you will think we have appointed too many Lay Gent'n to ye Convention. This was owing to an Opinion advanced by ye Clergy from ye Country, that it would expedite ye removing of any Prejudices that may be remaining. As it is preparatory to ye framing a Const'n, it will not be a Precedent under it.

I am, dear Sir,

Your Friend and Brother,

W. WHITE.

The following, which we quote from the Bp. White MSS. was Mr. Parker's reply :—

BOSTON, Septem'r 14, 1785.

REVRD AND DEAR SIR,— I have to acknowledge the Receipt of a Letter received from you about 6 weeks since inclosing the Act of Association of the Churches in the State of Pennsylvania, but the letter being without Date I cannot say how long it was on its Journey. I am with you equally sensible that the fifth of the fundamental Principles in the paper printed at N. York has operated much to the Disadvantage of that Convention. Had it stood as I proposed that a

Bishop (if one in any State) sh'd be President of the Convention, I make no doubt there would have been one present. You will be at no loss to conclude that I mean Doct'r Seabury, who you must 'ere this have heard is arrived and entered upon the exercise of his Offices in Connecticut. Being present in Convocation at Middletown the 4th of Aug'st last, I much urged his attending the Convention at Philadelphia this month, but that very Article discouraged him so much that no arguments I could use were sufficient to prevail with him. Had that Article stood as proposed, the Gentleman who moved the Amendment would not have suffered by it, nor [would] the Convention [have been] stigmatized as Anti-Episcopalian. It was at my Request that the Bishop with his clergy agreed to make some Alterations in the Liturgy and Offices of the Church, and a Com'tee from the body of the Clergy was chosen to attend him for that purpose, a report of which I was desired to lay before a Convention of Clergymen and Deputies from the churches in this State together with Rhode Island and New Hampshire, which was to meet the first Wednesday in this month. This Convention accordingly met, and have agreed to adopt the Alterations proposed at Middletown, (excepting two) and have agreed to a few others, which are to be proposed to the Churches in the other States. I am therefore directed by said Convention to forward to you, or to the President of the gen'l Convention to be held at Philadelphia the 27 of this month a copy of the Alterations proposed by our Convention, and to request a copy of the proceedings of that Body in order to compare notes and to see how near our Ideas agree. I accordingly enclose you now a copy of said proposed Alterations, and if you are not President of said Convention yourself [beg you] to deliver them to him with a request of our Convention that, they may be communicated to your Convention, and that we may be furnished with a copy of the proceedings of that Body before the time to which our Convention stands adjourned which is Octo'r 26th next.

As the expense of sending one or more Delegates to the gen'l Convention would be very considerable and must fall upon one or two churches, our Convention concluded not to send, as you will find by the vote following the proposed alterations.

Whether you will find time to revise the Canons, Articles, &c., of the Church, and the Liturgy also, or which you will enter upon first, is uncertain. I rather think that Canons and Articles, or an Ecclesiastical Constitution should be left to your Bishop (when you have one) with his Clergy; the Laity seem to be more concerned with the Liturgy, and the revision of that will take more time than they will be willing to spend at convention. I find that the fourth Article in the proposals printed at New York is disgusting to many of our Communion who

neither like the Doctrines held by the Church of England nor the Liturgy as it now stands, and if those are fundamental Principles how will you get rid of them? Some of the Doctrines held up in the 39 Articles I think are not founded in Scripture, and I could wish if they are taken into Consideration by the Convention, they may be amended.

The Doct'r McMoffat whom you say the Papers mention as having been consecrated was formerly a Custom house Officer at Newport, very unpopular and hated by the People. The article in the paper was intended only as Hum or a Reflection upon the Church.

I shall esteem it a favour if you will be so kind as to inform me what measures are adopted at your Convention and whether you make any alterations in the Liturgy, as we are perfectly disposed here to preserve a Uniformity in divine Worship and to adopt any measures that will tend to that end.

I am Dear Sir with respect and Esteem,
Your most affect'e Friend and Brother

SAMUEL PARKER.

A little later the long-expected Bishop of Connecticut reached his see and home, and the clergy of Connecticut, mindful of their promise to seek the co-operation of their brethren at the Southward in their efforts for the perfection of the Church's organization, now that a Bishop had been obtained, cordially invited Dr. White to meet with them in Convocation to welcome their Bishop and consult for the further good of the American Church.

STRATFORD, July 14, 1785.

DEAR SIR:—I am desired to acquaint you, that the Clergy of this State are to meet at Middletown in this State, on the third of August next, at which time and place, they would be much pleased to see you, and the rest of the Clergy of your State.

We must all wish for a Christian Union of all the Churches in the thirteen States, for which good purpose we must allow *private Convenience to give way to public Utility.*

We have no Views of usurping any authority over our Brothers and Neighbours, but wish them to unite with us, in the same friendly manner, that we are ready and willing to do, with them. I must earnestly entreat you to come upon this occasion, for the sake of the peace of the Church,—for your own satisfaction, in what friendly manner the Clergy here would treat you,—not to mention what happiness the sight of you would give to your sincere friend and brother,

JEREMIAH LEARNING.

The response to this cordial invitation was a letter, unfortunately not preserved, requesting the presence of the Bishop of Connecticut and his clergy at Philadelphia, at the approaching meeting in September. The acceptance of this invitation by Bishop Seabury was out of the question in view of the "fundamental principle" complained of in Mr. Parker's letter, which, written after personal conference with Seabury, is conclusive on this point. But this interchange of letters opened the way for a most important correspondence between the Bishop of Connecticut and the venerable Dr. Thomas Bradbury Chandler on the one hand, and the Rev. Drs. White and Smith on the other, which will fittingly introduce the record of the Philadelphia Convention of 1785.

MY DEAR SIR:—A day or two ago I received from Bishop Seabury, and was by him desired to forward the enclosed letters addressed to you and Dr. Smith. That to Dr. Smith was sent open for my inspection; and, instead of sealing it, I have taken the liberty to send it open to you, wishing that you also may have a sight of it. You will, therefore, after reading it, be so good as to seal and send it forward.

As the time of your *continental* Convention now approaches, I doubt not but you and the other friends of the Church in general, throughout the country, are beginning to grow very anxious about the event. For the fate of the Episcopal Church in America will, in a great measure, depend upon the deliberations and decisions of that general meeting. On this account I could wish to be present at a consultation of such capital importance; and, indeed, upon my late arrival from England, I found that I had been chosen as one of the Representatives of the Church in this State on the grand occasion; but such is my situation, with regard to a scorbutic, corrosive disorder, with which I have been long troubled, that I fear it will be impossible for me to accept the Commission by a personal attendance. Will you then permit me, in this way, to give you a sketch of my *hopes* and *apprehensions*, as well as my opinion on some matters relative to the case? From what I know of your character, I cannot doubt but you will; and not the less readily, on account of the freedom which I think it my duty to use, whenever I pretend to offer my opinion on the subject.

My *hopes* arise from the anxiety and concern, which have been so generally shown by the Episcopalian in the several States, for setting the Church upon a proper bottom—from the attachment they have discovered to the Episcopal mode of government—and from the veneration they have expressed for the *Liturgy* of the Church of

England, as the proper *Basis* of a Liturgy to be prepared for the general use of the churches in America. Now as such a disposition seems fortunately to prevail, I cannot but hope that, under the direction and blessing of Divine Providence, it will produce the happiest effects.

My apprehensions are owing to some measures that have been adopted by most of the *particular* Conventions, and some expedients that have been proposed, which are contrary to the established maxims of ecclesiastical polity, and the practice of the Church in all ages, a few modern instances excepted. In this I have reference to the admission of the *Laity* to *vote* in *ecclesiastical Councils*; the divesting Bishops of their proper and essential authority, and making them subject to their own Presbyters, &c., &c. The Church is a Society founded by *Christ*; all ecclesiastical authority and jurisdiction must be derived from *him*, and not from any natural rights, &c.;—this authority he was pleased to lodge in the hands of certain *officers* of his appointment, to be communicated to their successors;—those, therefore, who are *not officers* in the Church, i. e. the *Laity*, can have no share of ecclesiastical authority. And as to the other point: If the Bishops are not allowed to govern the Church, the Church is not under *Episcopal* government, and cannot be *Episcopal*; but is under the government of those who govern the Bishops.

The concessions of this kind which have been made by any of the Clergy, I suppose have been made through a desire to gratify and increase the number of the Church's friends; but we are not at liberty, even for so good an end, to alter the original constitution of the Church, and to sacrifice the essential rights of Episcopacy. Besides: although in this way we might, perhaps, gain some *new* friends, yet I am sure that we should lose many more *old* ones; and many thousands of the best-informed *Episcopalians* on this continent would renounce all communion with us—as would also the Church of England, to say nothing of the other *Episcopal* Churches in Europe. The consequence of this would be, that we should lose our respectability in the eyes of the world, be involved in eternal disputes with other *Episcopalians*, and wretchedly defeat our own purpose.

As to the *Laity*—I am clearly of opinion that they ought to be consulted on this occasion, and that it is proper that a representation of them should meet at the same time and place (I mean Town or City) with a representation of the Clergy. It depends upon *them* whether—how far—and in what manner, our Church shall be supported. But had I been in this country at the time of the first meetings, I should certainly have proposed, and if necessary have urged, that the two Conventions of the Clergy and *Laity* should be kept separate;—that a friendly communication between them should be

kept up, in the way of conference ; — that the Clergy, after mature deliberation, defining the nature and principles of that Church, to which they thought it their duty, under all circumstances, to adhere, should recommend it to the other Convention, and beg their support of it ; — that they should, from day to day, inform them of their proceedings, and be ready to hear their objections, and to consider their proposed alterations and amendments ; — but that they should by no means admit the Laity to *vote* with them on any ecclesiastical questions. Nor would the gentlemen of the Laity think such an exclusion, when candidly explained to them, any mark of our want of affection or respect for them ; for they can have no wish, but to see the just rights and dignity of their own Church duly ascertained and supported. They would as soon complain that they are not allowed to administer Baptism or the H. Eucharist.

Had I time, and would it not be tedious to you, I would make some remarks upon the several late Conventions, so far as they have come to my knowledge. But, for the present, I shall confine myself to a few hasty observations on the printed account of the transactions of the Convention in Virginia held in May last.

In the first place in addition to the general objection against the voting of Laymen in an ecclesiastical Council, it may be observed that, 1st, on some days the Lay-members of that Convention, who were twice as numerous as the Clerical ones, seem to have taken the lead ; for we find *Mr. Braxton in the chair*. This is so contrary to every idea of propriety and decorum, that I cannot but wonder that any one of the Laity should ever have proposed, or the Clergy have consented to, so unprecedented a mode of conduct.

Secondly. The Convention seem to have mistaken their *proper* business, which was, and could be, no other, than to agree upon the best expedients for supporting the interests and honour and rights of the Church in its present imperfect State, and to concert measures for compleating its constitution, by the introduction of an Episcopate as soon as possible. Here, in my humble opinion, they ought to have stopt ; and not, to have proceeded to *organize the government of the Church*, and to establish Canons, or *rules* for its future *order, government and discipline*. I believe it was never heard of before, that the Presbyters only, or the Presbyters and Laity, of an *Episcopal* Church, undertook to make ecclesiastical *Canons* ; which is the peculiar office of the Bishop or Bishops, with the advice of their Clergy. [See on this subject, Hooker, Potter, Bingham, and the *Original Draft*, in answer to Sir P. King, &c., &c.]

Thirdly. The Bishop, when introduced into Virginia, must not only be governed by Canons, in the forming of which no Bishop was ever consulted, but he must consent to give up a principal part of his office,

which has always been considered as *inalienable*, and consent to be little more than a *Parish Minister*. Although a Bishop *may* take particular charge of a Parish, yet this, I believe, is the first time that a Bishop was ever *obliged* to do so, and, however well he may otherwise be provided for, *to do the duty of a Parish Minister*. In consequence of this degradation, the Clergy are to meet together in *Presbyteries*, without the call of the Bishop, and are to enforce the Canons of the Church, without his authority ; which regulations are contrary to all the maxims of ecclesiastical polity, and to the very *essence* of an *Episcopal Church*. Instead of dividing the Clergy into *Presbyteries*, acting independently of the Bishop, why may not the several ends proposed by it be as well, or better, answered, by dividing them into *Archdeaconries* or *Rural Deanries*, acting under the authority of the Bishop, according to the practice of all other *Episcopal Churches*? In short, the whole system of discipline is so destructive to the authority of Bishops, that it must necessarily be reprobated by every real *Episcopalian* in Christendom, who duly considers it.

In saying this, I mean not to reflect upon those worthy persons, who constituted the above-mentioned Convention in Virginia. On the contrary, I applaud and honour the well-meant zeal which they discovered for supporting the interests of the Church, and I believe they acted, though wrongly, from worthy motives ; but their *accommodating* disposition evidently carried them much too far. And I cannot but hope that, upon a careful reconsideration of the proceedings they have published, they will be willing to rescind some of their decisions. I trust that the above points will be thoroughly discussed at the ensuing general Convention, in the spirit of peace, unity and concord. May the great Founder and Head of the Church, who has promised to be always with it to the end of the world, prosper your consultations, and bring them to a happy issue !

It will be of the utmost consequence to the *Episcopal Church* in America that it should preserve an uniformity, at least a similarity, *qualis decet esse Sororum*, through the different States. In Connecticut the Constitution of the Church is now compleated, as far as I can judge, upon right principles. I wish that in the other States the example may be followed ; for I do not believe that the Christian world affords one more conformable to the primitive pattern, all things considered, than the Church in Connecticut.

As I am hourly expecting the bearer to call upon me, I must now conclude. Possibly I may hereafter find myself disposed to resume this subject. In this Letter I have not had time to speak to the several points I intended, nor to study propriety of expression. However, if you think any thing here said or suggested may be useful, it is submitted to your disposal.

With my best compliments to your good Lady, I have the honour to subscribe myself, with much esteem,

Your affectionate Brother,

and humble Servant,

T. B. CHANDLER.

ELIZABETH-TOWN.

Sept. 2d, 1785.

To this important document, emanating from perhaps the foremost man in ability and reputation among the American clergy, was added a letter from Bishop Seabury to Dr. Smith.

This letter from the Bishop to Dr. Smith, referred to as "enclosed for Dr. White's perusal,"* is dated at "New London, August 15, 1785," and begins with the statement —

"That the grand difficulty that defeated my application for consecration in England appeared to me to be the want of an application from the State of Connecticut." The other objections that "there was no precise Diocese marked out by the civil authority" and no "stated revenue appointed for the Bishop's support" were obviated. The lack of this "formal requisition from the State" prevented the addition to the Bill for the ordination of foreign candidates for orders of a clause for consecrating American Bishops. Without parliamentary authority the Archbishop would not proceed, though the Bishop asserts "if I understood him right, a majority of the Judges and Crown Lawyers were of opinion he might safely do it." The question of the titles of church property is dismissed with the assertion that the Church in America "is still the Church of England subsisting under a different civil government." Mr. Wesley's course is referred to and his "ordination" characterised as "Presbyterian, and in direct opposition to the Church of England." The course of the Methodists is spoken of as "separation and schism." They are said to have "unreasonably, unnecessarily and wickedly" "broken the unity of the Church." The Bishop after expressing the pleasure it will give him till Maryland has a bishop of its own "to do everything" he can "for the supply of the churches" in the matter of ordination, proceeds to criticise the action of the Maryland Conven-

* This important communication is printed in the Appendix to Bp. White's *Memoirs of the Church* (second edition), pp. 286-292 inclusive. It is also given, with numerous corrections from the original MS., preserved among the Bp. White Papers in the writer's Historical Notes and Documents illustrating the Organisation of the American Church, pp. 76-82.

tions, the proceedings of which had been communicated to him by Dr. Smith. He judges that the convention erred "in establishing so many, and so precise, fundamental rules," thus precluding "after consideration." He considers that the Maryland Convention has "too much circumscribed the power of the Bishop." The position taken by this body "that the duty and office of a Bishop differs in nothing from that of other priests, except in the power of Ordination and Confirmation, and the right of precedence," etc., is ably discussed and controverted. The admission of the Laity to the Councils of the Church is also objected to by the Bishop, though he is willing to concede to them "a share in the choice of their Bishop — if it can be put on a proper footing, so as to avoid parley and confusion ;" and he appeals to the clergy and laity who are to meet at Philadelphia "to reconsider the matter before a final step be taken ; and to endeavour to bring their Church government as near to the primitive pattern as may be." The letter proceeds to express the wish that "the Spirit of God" may be with those about to assemble in Philadelphia, and asks that the letter should be communicated to the meeting ; together with a copy of the writer's letters of consecration.

Recurring to the same subject a few days later, Bishop Seabury addressed the following letter directly to Dr. White :—

NEW LONDON, Augt. 19, 1785.

REVEREND AND DEAR SIR,—I thank you for your several letters since my arrival in America, and particularly for the Pamphlets you sent me. I had heard of them, and wanted much to see them. I have not yet had time to do more than look at them, but should be glad to cultivate an acquaintance with a gentleman of so much learning and merit as the author* of the Letter and Reply evidently is.

It is a grief to me that I cannot be with you at your ensuing Convention. Neither my circumstances, nor duty will permit it. I am utterly unprovided for so long a journey, not being, at present, master even of a horse. I have written particularly to Dr. Smith, from whom I had a long letter, and have explained to him my sentiments on one or two points in your fundamental rules, which I fear are not right. I suppose, and expect, that Dr. Smith will read my letter to him to the Convention ; it is my wish he should. You, and the Brethren, and Gentlemen who shall assemble, will, my good Sir, excuse my apprehensions, and the freedom I have taken, to express myself, as an honest man should do, in plain language. And I hope you will be

* The Rev Charles Henry Wharton.

induced to reconsider the matters pointed out in my letter. The two points which I am most concerned about, are, your circumscribing the Episcopal power within such narrow bounds, depriving the Bishop of all government in the Church except as a Presbyter; and your subjecting him and yourselves to be tried before a Convention of Presbyters and laymen.

There are some other things which I think exceptionable; But if these two points are adhered to, it matters little how exceptionable your Constitution may be in other respects; because I conceive it impossible it should long subsist in its present form — It will either fall into parties, and dissolve, or sink into real Presbyterianism.

The enclosed are such alterations as have here been thought necessary, to accommodate our Liturgy to the civil Constitution of this State. Should more be done, it must be a work of time and great deliberation.

I am much obliged to you for your attention to the letters directed to your care from England. Please to make my regards to Dr. Magaw, Dr. Andrews, and Mr. Blackwell. I wish you a happy meeting — may the Holy Spirit be with you at your meeting, and direct your consultations to the good of his Church. I shall always be glad to hear from you. Messrs. Spragg, and Row, are now with me. Their business cannot be completed till the Ordination in September.

Believe me to be, Rev'd Sir, with esteem and regard, your affect'e Bro'r and Serv't,

SAMUEL, BP. EP. CH'CH CONNECT.

The replies to these earnest appeals have not been preserved. The views of Dr. White may be readily inferred from the following letter, addressed to him by Dr. Chandler a week before the time appointed for the meeting of the Convention :—

MY DEAR SIR :

I am greatly obliged to you for your polite invitation to put up at your house, and were I to come to Philadelphia, I would accept of it with pleasure; but my situation is such with regard to my disorder and the process I am pursuing in hope of removing it, that I find it will be impracticable. Whether my presence at the ensuing Convention would be of any use is a matter of uncertainty; yet were I able to attend I should think it my duty — and besides, I should have an opportunity of seeing some persons with whom I wish to be better acquainted.

Were you and I to talk over, at leisure, the business of this Convention, I flatter myself that, afterwards, we should not differ widely in

our opinions, upon most of the points in question. There is, however, one point, on which at present we seem to think very differently: I mean *the right of the Laity* to some share of ecclesiastical authority. In my former Letter I briefly suggested some reasons why I thought they should be excluded, and took the liberty to refer to some authors proper to be consulted on the subject. In yours of the 8th you offer several reasons why you think they ought to be admitted.

Your first reason is taken from what appears to you to have been the practice of the Prim. Church; but I think I have seen it unanswerably proved, over and over, by different authors, that there is nothing in ecclesiastical antiquity, or very little indeed, to countenance this claim of the Laity. You seem to wonder that I referred to *Hooker* on the subject, as you think his Sentiments are directly opposite to mine. It was indeed a long time since I had looked into *Hooker*, but I recollect the general drift of his *Book VII*, and more particularly some passages which, formerly, I had occasion to produce; such as, for instance: "a Bishop is a Minister of God, unto whom with permanent continuance, is committed — a power of chiefly in government over Presbyters as well as Laymen, a power to be by way of Jurisdiction, a Pastor even to Pastors themselves." Again: "We require you to find out but one Church upon the face of the whole earth, that hath been ordered by your discipline (i. e. a discipline much like that which was settled last May in Virginia) or hath not been ordered by ours, that is to say, by *Episcopal regiment*, since the time that the B. Apostles were here conversant. Many things out of antiquity ye bring, as if the purest times of the Church had observed the self-same orders which you require; and as though your desire were, that the Churches of old should be patterns for us to follow, and even glasses wherein we might see the practice of that, which by you is gathered out of Scripture. But the truth is, ye mean nothing less." From these and similar passages, I concluded that *Hooker* excluded the Laity from every part of purely ecclesiastical authority, and consequently from the highest act of it, viz: that of making *Canons*. I have since tumbled over some leaves of his Book, and I think it would be an easy task to prove that I was not mistaken with regard to his opinion. Had I time, I could point out much in *Bingham*, that clearly supports my side of the question. You allow that *Potter* is with me; and I will only observe, that what he wrote on the subject was never answered, or disputed with him. With regard to *Slater's Original Draft*, as you have never seen it, as he has handled the point before us in a masterly manner, as he wrote against a very erroneous and popular Book, and as I happen to have two copies of his work, I now send you one of them, and beg your acceptance of it. I wish you had time also to read *Maurice* on Diocesan Episcopacy, in

answer to *Baxter*—*Sage's Principles of the Cyprianic Age, and his Defence of it*—and Bp. *Hoadly* on Episcopal Ordination, who candidly and effectually confutes all these claims of the Laity. In short, this is a *radical* point, and I entreat you not to give your consent to robbing Episcopacy of its essential rights. I am the more urgent with *you* on this head, as I hope the time is not far distant when I am to see you vested with the Episcopal character. I have often talked the matter over with Bp. Seabury in London; and we both agreed that you were the properest person for the State of Pennsylvania, and, unless we should find ourselves mistaken with regard to your character, which I believe we were not, that we would do all that we consistently could to befriend you in this way.

Your *second* reason is: that in the Church of England nothing can be done without the Laity, &c. In answer to which I will only observe, that in that Church none are allowed the right of making Canons, but the two Houses of Convocation, who indeed must be called together by the King's Writ. Those Canons I confess cannot be *legally* binding upon the Laity without an Act of the State; but were it not for the *alliance* it has with the State, they would still be binding upon the *consciences of the faithful*. Where a government means to establish any particular Church, it has a right to make laws relative to that establishment, and to expect concessions from the Church, so far as they can be made consistently with its own principles, on that account. The Royal supremacy in England, founded on the *Act of Submission*, is a matter with which, at present, we have nothing to do, and is, I conceive, peculiar to an establishment. That the Laity should have their check upon the Clergy, I allow to be reasonable; but where they are patrons of all the Church Livings, have the means of supporting the Clergy in their own hands, and have an unquestionable right to prefer complaints or well-founded accusations against them, I think they have *check* enough in all conscience.

This last observation meets your *third* reason. Under this head you go on to say, that all *reasonable measures* (I suppose you mean of restraining the Clergy) *will, on the plan in question, be easier carried into effect, and sooner vindicated against misrepresentation*. This to me, is at present inconceivable; but my reasons must be omitted. Since I began this letter I have had an unlucky *fall*, which has almost blinded me, and so wounded my right hand, that I hold my pen with difficulty. However, before I conclude, I must not omit to inform you, that the explanation of some points given in your last Letter, has afforded me much satisfaction as it shews that we are not so different in our opinions, as I at first imagined. I wish that the Convention may be, in reality, as favourable to Episcopacy as your explanation is—but I have my fears.

I thank you for the pamphlets you sent, which have afforded me considerable amusement. Mr. Wharton appears to advantage in his publication, and his antagonist is a man of ingenuity and dexterity. They treat each other with personal respect, which I am pleased to see in all controversies. . . .

Very sincerely and affectionately yours,

T. B. CHANDLER.

ELIZ : TOWN, Sept. 20th, 1785.

It was with these wise counsels and suggestions that William White was prepared for the Michaelmas meeting of 1785. The influence of the sagacious words of Chandler, and the apostolic bearing and language of Seabury, finding as they did both sympathy and full appreciation in the heart of White, can be traced not only in the events that followed, but in the future policy and practice of the Church which it was the common object of each of these great and gifted men to serve.

WILLIAM STEVENS PERRY.

THE LAW OF THE CHURCH IN THE UNITED STATES.

CHAPTER VII.

GENESIS OF THE CONSTITUTION.

Conflicting Views among the Framers of the Constitution.

BISHOP WHITE's pamphlet was never put into general circulation, owing doubtless to the severe condemnation it received from the New England clergy and others to whom he submitted it for approval or disapproval. The reason he gave in after years was that "The necessity urged in it ceased to exist within a short time after the publication" of it. But, as will be seen from the following letters by the clergy of Connecticut, Bishop Seabury, the Rev. Dr. Chandler and the Rev. Mr. Duché, he must have been convinced that he had made rash statements concerning the Divine Order of the Church and even called in question the fulfilment of CHRIST's own promise, viz.: that He would be with the Church to the end of the world. A necessity can never arise calling for a departure from the Divine Order of the Church. While Bishop White's loyalty and devotion cannot be questioned, still in "The Case," etc., he showed that he was unacquainted with the Divine Constitution and Canon Law of the Church.

A LETTER FROM THE REV. ABRAHAM JARVIS, IN THE NAME OF THE CLERGY OF CONNECTICUT.

REVEREND SIR,—We, the clergy of Connecticut met at Woodbury in voluntary Convention, beg leave to acquaint you, that a small pamphlet, printed in Philadelphia, has been transmitted to us, of which you are said to be the author. This pamphlet proposes a new form of government in the Episcopal Church, and points at the method of erecting it. As the thirteen States have now risen to independent sovereignty, we agree with you, sir, that the chain which connected this with the mother Church is broken; that the American

Church is now left to stand in its own strength — and that some change in its regulations must in due time take place. But we think it premature and of dangerous consequence, to enter upon so capital a business, till we have resident bishops (if they can be obtained) to assist in the performance of it, and to form a new union in the American Church, under proper superiors, since its union is now broken with such superiors in the British Church. We shall only advert to such things in the pamphlet, as we esteem of dangerous consequence. You say the conduct you mean to recommend, is to include in the proposed frame of government a general approbation of Episcopacy, and a declaration of an intention to procure the succession as soon as conveniently may be ; but in the mean time to carry the plan into effect, without waiting for the succession. But why do you include a general approbation of Episcopacy, in your proposed new frame of government ? Not because you think bishops a constituent part of an Episcopal Church, unless you conceive they derive their office and existence from the King's authority ; for though you acknowledge we cannot at present have bishops here, and propose to set up without them, yet you say no constitutional principle of our Church is changed by the Revolution, but what was founded on the authority of the King. Your motives for the above general approbation, seem indeed to be purely political. One is, that the general opinion of Episcopilians is in favor of bishops, and therefore (if we understand your reasoning) it would be impolitic not to flatter them with the hopes of it. Another reason is, that too wide a deviation from the British Church might induce future immigrants from thence to set up independent Churches here. But could you have proposed to set up the ministry, without waiting for the succession, had you believed the Episcopal superiority to be an ordinance of CHRIST, with the exclusive authority of ordination and government, and that it has ever been so esteemed in the purest ages of the Church ? and yet we conceive this to be the sense of Episcopilians in general, and warranted by the constant practice of the Christian Church. Really, sir, we think an Episcopal Church without Episcopacy, if it be not a contradiction in terms, would, however, be a new thing under the sun ; and yet the Episcopal Church, by the pamphlet proposed to be erected, must be in this predicament till the succession be obtained. You plead necessity, however, and argue that the best writers in the Church, admit of Presbyterian ordination, where Episcopal cannot be had. To prove this, you quote concessions from the venerable Hooker, and Dr. Chandler, which their exuberant charity to the reformed churches abroad, led them to make. But the very words you quote from the last mentioned gentlemen prove his opinion to be, that bishops were as truly an ordinance of CHRIST, and as essential to his Church as the sacraments ; for, say

you, he insists upon it (meaning the Episcopal superiority) as of Divine right, asserts that the laws relating to it bind as strongly as the laws which relate to baptism and the holy Eucharist, and that if the succession be once broken, not all the men on earth, not all the angels in Heaven, without an immediate commission from CHRIST, can restore it — but you say, he does not, however, hold this succession to be necessary, only where it can be had. Neither does he or the Christian Church hold the sacraments to be necessary, where they cannot be had agreeable to the appointment of the Great Head of the Church. Why should particular acts of authority be thought more necessary than the authority itself? Why should the sacraments be more essential than that authority CHRIST has ordained to administer them? It is true that CHRIST has appointed the sacraments, and it is as true that He hath appointed officers to administer them, and has expressly forbid any to do it but those who are authorised by his appointment, or called of God as was Aaron. And yet these gentlemen (without any inconsistency with their declared sentiments) have, and all good men will express their charitable hopes, that God, in compassion to a well meant zeal, will add the same blessings to those who, through unavoidable mistake, act beside His commission as if they really had it. As far as we can find, it has been the constant opinion of our Church in England and here, that the Episcopal superiority is an ordinance of CHRIST, and we think that the uniform practice of the whole American Church, for near a century, sending their candidates three thousand miles for Holy Orders, is more than a presumptive proof that the Church here are, and ever have been, of this opinion. The sectaries, soon after the reformation, declared that the book of consecration, etc., was superstitious and contrary to God's word, and the moderation you mention in the articles and canons, consists in affirming that this declaration was entirely false; and would you wish to be more severe? The instances you adduce, wherein Presbyterian ordination has been tolerated in the Church, have, by its best writers, been set in such a point of view, as to give no countenance to your scheme, and the authorities you quote have been answered again and again. If you will not allow this superiority to have an higher origin than the Apostles; yet since they were Divinely inspired, we see not why their practice is not equal to a Divine warrant; and as they have given no liberty to deviate from their practice in any exigence of the Church, we know not what authority we have to take such liberties in any case. However, we think nothing can be more clear, than that our Church has ever believed bishops to have the sole right of ordination and government, and that this regimen was appointed of CHRIST Himself, and it is now, to use your own words, humbly submitted to consideration, whether such Episcopalianas as

consent even to a temporary departure, and set aside this ordinance of CHRIST for convenience, can scarcely deserve the name of Christians. But would necessity warrant a deviation from the law of CHRIST, and the immemorial practice of the Church, yet what necessity have we to plead? Can we plead necessity with any propriety, till we have tried to obtain an Episcopate, and have been rejected? We conceive the present to be a more favorable opportunity for the introduction of bishops, than this country has before seen. However dangerous bishops formerly might have been thought to the civil rights of these States, this danger has now vanished, for such superiors will have no civil authority. They will be purely ecclesiastics. The States have now risen to sovereign authority, and bishops will be equally under the control of civil law with other clergymen; no danger, then, can now be feared from bishops, but such as may be feared from presbyters. This being the case, have we not the highest reason to hope, that the whole civil authority upon the continent (should their assistance be needed) will unite their influence with the Church, to procure an office so essential to it, and to render complete a profession, which contains so considerable a proportion of its inhabitants? And on the other hand, is there any reason to believe, that all the bishops in England, and in all the other reformed Churches in Europe, are so totally lost to a sense of their duty, and to the real wants of their brethren in the Episcopal Church here, as to refuse to ordain bishops to preside over us, when a proper application shall be made to them for it? If this cannot be, why is not the present a favorable opportunity for such an application? Nothing is further from the design of this letter than to begin a dispute with you; but in a frank and brotherly way to express our opinion of the mistaken and dangerous tendency of the pamphlet. We fear, should the scheme of it be carried into execution in the Southern States, it will create divisions in the Church at a time when its whole strength depends upon its unity; for we know it is totally abhorrent from the principles of the Church in the Northern States, and are fully convinced they will never submit to it. And indeed should we consent to a temporary departure from Episcopacy, there would be very little propriety in asking for it afterwards, and as little reason ever to expect it in America. Let us all then unite as one man to improve this favorable opportunity, to procure an object so desirable and so essential to the Church.

We are, dear sir, your affectionate brethren, the clergy of Connecticut.

Signed by order of the Convention,

ABRAHAM JARVIS, Sec'y.

Rev. Mr. WHITE.
WOODBURY, March 25, 1887.

A LETTER FROM BISHOP SEABURY TO THE REV. DR. SMITH.

August, 15, 1785.

REV. AND DEAR SIR,— It has not been in my power till this day to pay that attention to your letter of July 19, which the importance of its several subjects demanded. The grand difficulty that defeated my application for consecration in England, appeared to me to be the want of an application from the State of Connecticut. Other objections were made, viz., that there was no precise Diocese marked out by the civil authority, nor a stated revenue appointed for the bishop's support ; but those were removed. The other remained, for the civil authority in Connecticut is Presbyterian, and therefore could not be supposed would petition for a bishop ; and had this been removed, I am not sure another would not have started up ; for this happened to me several times. I waited and procured a copy of an act of the legislature of Connecticut, which puts all denominations of Christians on a footing of equality, except the Roman Catholics, and to them it gives a free toleration, certified by the Secretary of the State ; for to Connecticut all my negotiations were confined. The Archbishop of Canterbury wished it had been fuller, but thought it afforded ground on which to proceed ; yet he afterwards said it would not do ; and that the Minister, without a formal requisition from the State, would not suffer the bill, enabling the Bishop of London to ordain foreign candidates without their taking the oaths, to pass the Commons, if it contained a clause for consecrating American bishops. And as his Grace did not choose to proceed without parliamentary authority, though if I understood him right, a majority of the judges and crown lawyers, were of opinion he might safely do it, I turned my attention to the remains of the old Scots Episcopal Church, whose consecrations I knew were derived from England, and their authority, in an ecclesiastical sense, fully equal to the English bishops. No objection was ever made to me on account of the legacies left for American bishops ; some people had surmises of this kind, but I know not whence they arose.

I can see no good ground of apprehension concerning the titles of estates, or emoluments belonging to the Church in your State ; your Church is still the Church of England, subsisting under a different civil government. We have in America the Church of Holland, of Scotland, of Sweden, of Moravia, and why not of England ? Our being the Church of England, no more implies dependence on or subjection to England, than being of the Church of Holland implies subjection to Holland. The plea of the Methodists is something like impudence. Mr. Wesley is only a presbyter, and all his ordinations Presbyterian, and in direct opposition to the Church of England.

And they can have no pretence for calling themselves Churchmen, till they return to the unity of the Church, which they have unreasonably, unnecessarily, and wickedly broken, by their separation and schism.

Your two cautions, respecting recommendations and titles, are certainly just. Till you are so happy as to have a bishop of your own, it will be a pleasure to me to do everything I can for the supply of your churches. And I am confident the clergy of Maryland and the other States will be very particular with regard to the qualifications and titles of persons to be admitted into their own order. Should they think proper to send any candidates hither, I could wish that it might be at the stated times of ordination; because the clergy here living so scattered, it is not easy, on every emergency, to get three of them together; and never without some expense, which they cannot well afford. I cannot omit to mention again the particular satisfaction Mr. Ferguson gave, not only to me but to all our clergy. I hope he will prove a worthy and useful clergyman. I flatter myself he got home without any disagreeable accident.

I thank you for your communications respecting Washington College, and the various conventions you have had in your State and neighborhood. The clergy and laity have particular merit in making so great exertions to get our Church into a settled and respectful state. But on objects of such magnitude and variety, it is to be expected that sentiments will differ. All men do not always see the same object in the same light; and persons at a distance are not always masters of the precise reasons and circumstances, which have occasioned particular modes of acting. Of some things therefore in your proceedings I cannot be a competent judge without minute information; and I am very sorry that my present circumstances and duty here, will not permit me to make so long a journey at this time; because by personal interview and conversation only can such information be had.

But, my dear sir, there are some things which, if I do not much misapprehend, are really wrong. In giving my opinion of them, I must claim the same privilege of judging for myself which others claim, and also that right of fair and candid interpretation of my sentiments which is due to all men.

i. I think you have done wrong in establishing so many and so precise fundamental rules. You seem thereby to have precluded yourselves from the benefit of after consideration. And by having the power of altering fundamental laws diffused through so large a body, it appears to me next to impossible to have them altered, even in some reasonable cases; because cases really reasonable may not appear so to two thirds of so large an assembly. It should also be remembered,

that while human nature is as it is, something of party passion or partiality will ever be apt, in some degree, to influence the views and debates of a numerous and mixed assembly.

2. I think you have too much circumscribed the power of your bishop. That the duty and office of a bishop differs in nothing from that of other priests, except in the power of ordination and confirmation [Pamphlet, p. 16] and the right precedence, etc., is a position that carries Jerome's opinion to the highest pitch. *Quid facit Episcopus quod presbyter non faciat, excepta ordinatione?* But it does not appear that Jerome had the support of the Church in this opinion, but rather the contrary. Government as essentially pertains to bishops as ordination; nay, ordination is but the particular exercise of government. Whatever share of government presbyters have in the Church, they have from the bishop, and must exercise it in conjunction with or in subordination to him. And though a congregation may have a right, and I am willing to allow it, to choose their minister, as they are to support him and live under his ministry, yet the bishop's concurrence or license is necessary, because they are part of his charge, has the care of their souls, and therefore the minister's authority to take charge of that congregation must come through the bishop.

The choice of the bishop is in the presbyters; but the neighboring bishops, who are to consecrate him, must have the right of judging whether he be a proper person or not. The presbyters are the bishop's council, without whom he ought to do nothing but matters of course. The presbyters have always a check upon their bishop, because they can, neither bishop nor presbyters, do anything beyond the common course of duty, without each other. I mean with regard to a particular Diocese, for it does not appear that presbyters had any seat in general councils, but by particular indulgence.

The people, being the patrons of the churches in this country, and having the means of the bishop's and minister's support in their hands, have a sufficient restraint upon them. In cases that require it, they can apply to their bishop, who, with the assistance of his presbyters, will proceed, as the case may require, to censure, suspension, or deposition of the offending clergyman. If a bishop behaves amiss, the neighboring bishops are his judges. Men that are not to be trusted with these powers are not fit to be bishops or presbyters at all.

This, I take it, is the constitution of the Christian Church, in its pure and simple state. And it is a constitution which, if adhered to, will carry itself into good effect. This constitution we have adopted in Connecticut; and we do hope and trust that we shall, by God's grace, exhibit to the world, in our government, discipline, and order, a pure and perfect model of primitive simplicity.

Presbyters cannot be too careful in choosing their bishops, nor the

people in choosing their minister. Improper men may, however, sometimes succeed ; and so they will make as exact rules, and circumscribe their power, as you can. And an improper man in the Church is an improper man, however he came there, and however his power be limited. The more you circumscribe him, the greater temptation he is under to form a party to support him ; and when his party is formed, all the power of your convention will not be able to displace him. In short, if you get a bad man, your laws and regulations will not be effectual ; if a good man, the general laws of the Church are sufficient.

Where civil States have made provision for ministers, it seems reasonable that they should define the qualifications, and regulate the conduct of those who are to enjoy the emolument. But voluntary associations for the exercise of such powers as your convention is to have, are always apt, such is the infirmity of human nature, to fall into parties ; and when party enters, animosity and discord soon follow. From what has been said, you will suppose I shall object

3. To the admission of lay members into synods, etc. I must confess I do, especially in the degree your fundamental rules allow. I have as great a regard for the laity as any man can have. It is for their sake that ministers are appointed in the Church. I have no idea of aggrandising the clergy at the expense of the laity ; nor indeed aggrandising them at all. Decent means of living is all they have a right to expect. But I cannot conceive that the laity can, with any propriety, be admitted to sit in judgment on bishops and presbyters, especially when deposition may be the event ; because they cannot take away a character which they cannot confer. It is incongruous to every idea of Episcopal government. That authority which confers power, can, for proper reasons, take it away. But where there is no authority to confer power, there can be none to disannul it. Wherever, therefore, the power of ordination is lodged, the power of deprivation is lodged also.

Should it be thought necessary that the laity should have a share in the choice of their bishop, if it can be put on a proper footing, so as to avoid party and confusion, I see not but that it might be admitted. But I do not apprehend that this was the practice of the primitive Church. In short, the rights of the Christian Church arise, not from nature or compact, but from the institution of CHRIST, and we ought not to alter them, but to receive and maintain them as the holy Apostles left them. The government, sacraments, faith, and doctrines of the Church are fixed and settled. We have a right to examine what they are, but we must take them as they are. If we new model the government, why not the sacraments, creeds, and doctrines of the Church ? But then it would not be CHRIST's Church, but our Church, and would remain so, call it by what name we please.

618 *The Law of the Church in the United States.*

I do therefore beseech the clergy and laity, who shall meet at Philadelphia, to reconsider the matter, before a final step be taken ; and to endeavor to bring their Church government as near to the primitive pattern as may be. They will find it the simplest and most easy to carry into effect ; and if it be adhered to, will be in no danger of sinking or failing.

I do not think it necessary that the Church in every State should be just as the Church in Connecticut is, though I think that the best model. Particular circumstances, I know, will call for particular considerations. But in so essential a matter as Church government is, no alteration should be made that affect its foundation. If a man be called a bishop who has not the Episcopal power of government, he is called by a wrong name, even though he should have the power of ordination and confirmation.

Let me therefore again entreat, that such material alterations, and forgive me if I say unjustifiable ones, may not be made in the government of the Church. I have written freely, as becomes an honest man ; and in a case which I think calls for freedom of sentiment and expression. I wish not to give offence, and I hope none will be taken. Whatever I can do consistently to assist in procuring bishops in America, I shall do cheerfully, but beyond that I cannot go, and I am sure neither you, nor any of the friends of the Church, would wish that I should.

If any expression in this letter should seem too warm, I will be ready to correct the mode, but the sentiments I must retain till I find them wrong, and then I will freely give them up. In this matter I am not interested ; my ground is taken, and I wish not to extend my authority beyond its present limits. But I do most earnestly wish to have our Church in all the States so settled, that it may be one Church united in government, doctrine, and discipline—that there may be no divisions among us—no opposition of interests—no clashing of opinions. And permit me to hope that you will, at your approaching convention, so far recede in the points I have mentioned, as to make this practicable. Your convention will be large and very much to be respected. Its determination will influence many of the American States, and posterity will be materially affected by them.

These considerations are so many arguments for calm and cool deliberation. Human passions and prejudices, and, if possible, infirmities, should be laid aside. A wrong step will be attended with dreadful consequences. Patience and prudence must be exercised. And should there be some circumstances that press hard for a remedy, hasty decisions will not mend them. In doubtful cases they will probably have a bad effect.

May the Spirit of God be with you at Philadelphia, and as I per-

suade myself, the sole good of His Church is the sole aim of you all, I hope for the best effects from your meeting.

I send you the alterations which it has been here thought proper to make in the Liturgy, to accommodate it to the civil constitution of this State. You will observe that there is no Collect for the Congress. We have no backwardness in that respect, but thought it our duty to know whether the civil authority in this State has any directions to give in that matter, and that cannot be known till the next meeting in October.

Some other alterations were proposed, of which Mr. Ferguson took a copy, and I would send you a copy had I time to transcribe it.

The matter will be resumed at New Haven September 14. Should we come to any determination the brethren to the Southward shall be informed of it.

With my best regards to the convention and to you, I remain your affectionate humble servant,

[Signed]

SAMUEL,

Bishop of the Episcopal Church in Connecticut.

[Quoted by the Rev. Dr. Beardsley in his *Life and Correspondence of the Rt. Rev. Samuel Seabury, D. D.*, pp. 229-236.]

NEW LONDON, Augt. 19, 1785.

REVEREND AND DEAR SIR,—I thank you for your several letters since my arrival in America, and particularly for the Pamphlets you sent me. I had heard of them, and wanted much to see them. I have not yet had time to do more than look at them, but should be glad to cultivate an acquaintance with a gentleman of so much learning and merit as the author* of the Letter and Reply evidently is.

It is a grief to me that I cannot be with you at your ensuing Convention. Neither my circumstances, nor duty will permit it. I am utterly unprovided for so long a journey, not being, at present, master even of a horse. I have written particularly to Dr. Smith, from whom I had a long letter, and have explained to him my sentiments on one or two points in your fundamental rules, which I fear are not right. I suppose, and expect, that Dr. Smith will read my letter to him to the Convention; it is my wish he should. You, and the Brethren, and Gentlemen who shall assemble, will, my good Sir, excuse my apprehensions, and the freedom I have taken, to express myself, as an honest man should do, in plain language. And I hope you will be induced to reconsider the matters pointed out in my letter. The two points which I am most concerned about, are, your circumscribing the Episcopal power within such narrow bounds, depriving the Bishop of all government in the Church except as a Presbyter; and your sub-

* The Rev. Charles Henry Wharton.

jecting him and yourselves to be tried before a Convention of Presbyters and laymen.

There are some other things which I think exceptionable; But if these two points are adhered to, it matters little how exceptionable your Constitution may be in other respects; because I conceive it impossible it should long subsist in its present form — It will either fall into parties, and dissolve, or sink into real Presbyterianism.

The enclosed are such alterations as have here been thought necessary, to accommodate our Liturgy to the civil Constitution of this State. Should more be done, it must be a work of time and great deliberation.

I am much obliged to you for your attention to the letters directed to your care from England. Please to make my regards to Dr. Magaw, Dr. Andrews, and Mr. Blackwell. I wish you a happy meeting — may the Holy Spirit be with you at your meeting, and direct your consultations to the good of his Church. I shall always be glad to hear from you. Messrs. Spragg, and Row, are now with me. Their business cannot be completed till the Ordination in September.

Believe me to be, Rev'd Sir, with esteem and regard, your affect'e Bro'r and Serv't,

SAMUEL, Bp. Ep. Ch'ch Connect.

MY DEAR SIR: — A day or two ago I received from Bishop Seabury, and was by him desired to forward the enclosed letters addressed to you and Dr. Smith. That to Dr. Smith was sent open for my inspection; and, instead of sealing it, I have taken the liberty to send it open to you, wishing that you also may have a sight of it. You will, therefore, after reading it, be so good as to seal and send it forward.

As the time of your *continental* Convention now approaches, I doubt not but you and the other friends of the Church in general, throughout the country, are beginning to grow very anxious about the event. For the fate of the Episcopal Church in America will, in a great measure, depend upon the deliberations and decisions of that general meeting. On this account I could wish to be present at a consultation of such capital importance; and, indeed, upon my late arrival from England, I found that I had been chosen as one of the Representatives of the Church in this State on the grand occasion; but such is my situation, with regard to a scorbutic, corrosive disorder, with which I have been long troubled, that I fear it will be impossible for me to accept the Commission by a personal attendance. Will you then permit me, in this way, to give you a sketch of my *hopes* and *apprehensions*, as well as my opinion on some matters relative to the case? From what I know of your character, I cannot doubt but you will; and not the less readily, on account of the freedom which I

think it my duty to use, whenever I pretend to offer my opinion on the subject.

My *hopes* arise from the anxiety and concern, which have been so generally shown by the Episcopalians in the several States, for setting the Church upon a proper bottom — from the attachment they have discovered to the Episcopal mode of government — and from the veneration they have expressed for the *Liturgy* of the Church of England, as the proper *Basis* of a Liturgy to be prepared for the general use of the churches in America. Now as such a disposition seems fortunately to prevail, I cannot but hope that, under the direction and blessing of Divine Providence, it will produce the happiest effects.

My *apprehensions* are owing to some measures that have been adopted by most of the *particular* Conventions, and some expedients that have been proposed, which are contrary to the established maxims of ecclesiastical polity, and the practice of the Church in all ages, a few modern instances excepted. In this I have reference to the admission of the *Laity* to *vote* in *ecclesiastical Councils*; the divesting Bishops of their proper and essential authority, and making them subject to their own Presbyters, &c., &c. The Church is a Society founded by *Christ*; all ecclesiastical authority and jurisdiction must be derived from *Him*, and not from any natural rights, &c.; — this authority He was pleased to lodge in the hands of certain *officers* of His appointment, to be communicated to their successors; — those, therefore, who are *not officers* in the Church, i. e. the *Laity*, can have no share of ecclesiastical authority. And as to the other point: If the bishops are not allowed to govern the Church, the Church is not under *Episcopal* government, and cannot be *Episcopal*; but is under the government of those who govern the Bishops.

The concessions of this kind which have been made by any of the Clergy, I suppose have been made through a desire to gratify and increase the number of the Church's friends; but we are not at liberty, even for so good an end, to alter the original Constitution of the Church, and to sacrifice the essential rights of Episcopacy. Besides: although in this way we might, perhaps, gain some *new* friends, yet I am sure that we should lose many more *old* ones; and many thousands of the best-informed Episcopalians on this continent would renounce all communion with us — as would also the Church of England, to say nothing of the other Episcopal Churches in Europe. The consequence of this would be, that we should lose our respectability in the eyes of the world, be involved in eternal disputes with other Episcopalians, and wretchedly defeat our own purpose.

As to the *Laity* — I am clearly of opinion that they ought to be consulted on this occasion, and that it is proper that a representation

of them should meet at the same time and place (I mean Town or City) with a representation of the Clergy. It depends upon *them* whether — how far — and in what manner, our Church shall be supported. But had I been in this country at the time of the first meetings, I should certainly have proposed, and if necessary have urged, that the two Conventions of the Clergy and Laity should be kept separate ; — that a friendly communication between them should be kept up, in the way of conference ; — that the Clergy, after mature deliberation, defining the nature and principles of that Church, to which they thought it their duty, under all circumstances, to adhere, should recommend it to the other Convention, and beg their support of it ; — that they should, from day to day, inform them of their proceedings, and be ready to hear their objections, and to consider their proposed alterations and amendments ; — but that they should by no means admit the Laity to *vote* with them on any ecclesiastical questions. Nor would the gentlemen of the Laity think such an exclusion, when candidly explained to them, any mark of our want of affection or respect for them ; for they can have no wish, but to see the just rights and dignity of their own Church duly ascertained and supported. They would as soon complain that they are not allowed to administer Baptism or the Holy Eucharist.

Had I time, and would it not be tedious to you, I would make some remarks upon the several late Conventions, so far as they have come to my knowledge. But, for the present, I shall confine myself to a few hasty observations on the printed account of the transactions of the Convention in Virginia held in May last.

In the first place in addition to the general objection against the voting of Laymen in an ecclesiastical Council, it may be observed that, 1st, on some days the Lay-members of that Convention, who were twice as numerous as the Clerical ones, seem to have taken the lead ; for we find *Mr. Braxton in the chair*. This is so contrary to every idea of propriety and decorum, that I cannot but wonder that any one of the Laity should ever have proposed, or the Clergy have consented to, so unprecedented a mode of conduct.

Secondly. The Convention seem to have mistaken their *proper* business, which was, and could be, no other, than to agree upon the best expedients for supporting the interests and honour and rights of the Church in its present imperfect state, and to concert measures for completing its Constitution, by the introduction of an Episcopate as soon as possible. Here, in my humble opinion, they ought to have stopt ; and not, to have proceeded to *organize the government of the Church*, and to establish Canons, or *rules* for its future *order, government and discipline*. I believe it was never heard of before, that the Presbyters only, or the Presbyters and Laity, of an *Episcopal* Church,

undertook to make ecclesiastical *Canons*; which is the peculiar office of the Bishop or Bishops, with the advice of their Clergy. [See on this subject, Hooker, Potter, Bingham, and the *Original Draft*, in answer to Sir P. King, &c., &c.]

Thirdly. The Bishop, when introduced into Virginia, must not only be governed by Canons, in the forming of which no Bishop was ever consulted, but he must consent to give up a principal part of his office, which has always been considered as *inalienable*, and consent to be little more than a *Parish Minister*. Although a Bishop may take particular charge of a Parish, yet this, I believe, is the first time that a Bishop was ever *obliged* to do so, and, however well he may otherwise be provided for, *to do the duty of a Parish Minister*. In consequence of this degradation, the Clergy are to meet together in *Presbyteries*, without the call of the Bishop, and are to enforce the Canons of the Church, without his authority; which regulations are contrary to all the maxims of ecclesiastical polity, and to the very *essence* of an *Episcopal Church*. Instead of dividing the Clergy into *Presbyteries*, acting independently of the Bishop, why may not the several ends proposed by it be as well, or better, answered, by dividing them into *Archdeaconries* or *Rural Deanries*, acting under the authority of the Bishop, according to the practice of all other *Episcopal Churches*? In short, the whole system of discipline is so destructive to the authority of Bishops, that it must necessarily be reprobated by every real *Episcopalian* in Christendom, who duly considers it.

In saying this, I mean not to reflect upon those worthy persons, who constituted the above-mentioned Convention in Virginia. On the contrary, I applaud and honour the well-meant zeal which they discovered for supporting the interests of the Church, and I believe they acted, though wrongly, from worthy motives; but their *accommodating* disposition evidently carried them much too far. And I cannot but hope that, upon a careful reconsideration of the proceedings they have published, they will be willing to rescind some of their decisions. I trust that the above points will be thoroughly discussed at the ensuing general Convention, in the spirit of peace, unity and concord. May the great Founder and Head of the Church, who has promised to be always with it to the end of the world, prosper your consultations, and bring them to a happy issue!

It will be of the utmost consequence to the *Episcopal Church* in America that it should preserve an uniformity, at least a similarity, *qualis decet esse Sororum*, through the different States. In Connecticut the Constitution of the Church is now compleated, as far as I can judge, upon right principles. I wish that in the other States the example may be followed; for I do not believe that the Christian world affords one more conformable to the primitive pattern, all things considered, than the Church in Connecticut.

As I am hourly expecting the bearer to call upon me, I must now conclude. Possibly I may hereafter find myself disposed to resume this subject. In this Letter I have not had time to speak to the several points I intended, nor to study propriety of expression. However, if you think any thing here said or suggested may be useful, it is submitted to your disposal.

With my best compliments to your good Lady, I have the honour to subscribe myself, with much esteem,

Your affectionate Brother,

and humble Servant,

T. B. CHANDLER.

ELIZABETH-TOWN.

Sept. 2d, 1785.

ASYLUM, LAMBETH, Feb. 10th, 1785.

MY DEAR SIR,— Your Conclusions at N. York, I must tell you plainly are quite inconsistent with the Discipline of the Church of England, which you profess to make your Model, so far as she may be supposed unconnected with any Civil Power. They are also inconsistent with that Form of Ecclesiastical Discipline, which prevailed in the purest period of the Christian Church. They seem to be wholly formed upon y^e Presbyterian Model, and calculated to introduce the same Kind of Government in the Church, that is established in your State. Whereas the State, according to their own acknowledgment will have nothing to do in Church Matters. You have it therefore in your [power] to form a Church perfectly primitive, and absolutely uncontrouled by any Civil Power, so far as its Laws do not interfere with those of the State.

Judge then with what Astonishment every true Episcopalian must view your Treatment of the Episcopal Order, by declaring, as you have done, that they shall have no distinction at your Conventions, but only be considered as Members, ex officio. I consider this as fundamentally wrong. An Episcopal Clergyman cannot confound the Orders of Bishop and Priest, and withhold his Assent from due Subordination.

These and other Matters, I hope, will be properly cleared up and settled on the Arrival of Bishop Seabury, who sails for N. York some time during the present Month. He is a truly primitive Bishop, consecrated by three Bishops in Scotland, where the Apostolical Succession has been inviolably preserved, as appears from the Register he takes with him. He has taken no Oath of any kind to any Power on Earth, and therefore comes to you in "unquestionable Form;" just such a Bishop as you could have wished for, and such as you could by no other means have obtained. Receive him, therefore, I beseech you, with Cordial Affection, and with that Christian Respect which is due to his high and sacred Office. Suffer no Schism in y^e Church.

Providence has sent him to accomplish and preserve a compleat Union in your new American Episcopal Church. His Consecration, you know, cannot be approved of here, for Reasons obvious to those who know the Connection of the Church with the State. I, therefore, could not ask him to officiate for me, neither would he for prudential and proper Reasons. He considers himself, and must be considered here, as a foreign Bishop. God grant that you may all be kept in y^e Unity of the Spirit, and y^e Bond of Peace.

By Capt. Willett you will receive a Box of Books directed for you, containing two vols. of Chambers' Dictionary and Turrelini's *Compendium Theologiae*, which by mistake were supposed to be mine, and packed up with my Books by some of my friends; but which really belong to your Church Library. The other books are directed to Mrs. Hopkinson, which I must beg the favour of you to deliver, together with a Packet for Mr. John David, Silversmith, in Front street.

I am sorry to hear so much of Party Commotions and Private Distresses from Philada. Where Discord once makes a Breach into the peace of a State, Love flies thro' it, and does not readily return. I thank sincerely the good Providence of my GOD for my present happy Asylum. Adieu. My Father is in high health and spirits, and says he never lived so happy. Mrs. Duché and my young folk well, and all join in love to you and yours, with

Your affectionate Friend and Servt, J. DUCHÉ.

N. B.—This Letter is for your private use, and not to be shown.

The Rev. Jacob Duché was the rector of Christ Church, Philadelphia, at the beginning of the Revolutionary War, and Bishop White was his assistant. In his *Memoirs of the Church* Bishop White says that a warm friendship existed between them. This fact makes all the more significant the comment of his friend.

HENRY MASON BAUM.

Contemporary Literature.

Biography.

*Fortunes made in Business** is not written in an attractive style. The "various writers" who have contributed to it exhibit different degrees of discrimination and literary skill, and do not always make the most of their material. But the career of such men as John Horrocks of Preston, Sir William Armstrong, the Platts of Oldham, and other mercantile giants of the North of England, must be rich in presentations of the solid qualities of shrewdness, perseverance, courage, and integrity, and could hardly fail to be both instructive and suggestive.

The Rothschilds† are of such world-wide fame that a good history of the rapid rise and continuous good fortune of their dynasty will be eagerly read. Mr. Reeves, in a volume of exceptional merit, has traced the growth of their influence from the time when, barely a hundred and fifty years ago, the fountain-head of the family kept a small shop at Frankfort, at the Sign of the Red Shield (Roth-schild). The story of Mayer Amschel's appointment as financial agent to the Landgrave of Hesse, and of his conspicuous success; of the settlement of his five sons in the great capitals of Europe; how it was that they became the real arbiters of peace and war, etc., is well told. It is a painful study to contemplate the mean tricks and artifices to which determined speculators resort, and the weapons which they complacently wield.

The four characteristic studies contributed by Mr. Walter Pater to *Macmillan's Magazine*, between the autumn of 1885 and the spring of the present year, are now published in a volume under the title of *Imaginary Portraits*.‡ The idealised portraits are those of Antony

* *Fortunes made in Business. A series of original sketches, biographical and anecdotic, from the recent history of Industry and Commerce.* By various writers. Vol. III. London : Sampson Low & Co. New York : Baum & Geddes.

† *The Rothschilds: The Financial Rulers of Nations.* By JOHN REEVES. London : Sampson Low & Co. New York : Baum & Geddes.

‡ *Imaginary Portraits.* By Walter Pater. London and New York : Macmillan & Co.

Watteau, "A Prince of Court Painters," Sebastian Von Storck, Duke Carl of Rosenmold, and Denys L'Auxerrois. They are drawn with a delicacy of touch, a minuteness of detail, and smoothness of finish which remind us of the work of the great miniature artists of the seventeenth century.

*Obiter Dicta** is a series of agreeably written essays on Milton, Pope, & Johnson, Burke, etc. The author says that "reading is not a duty, and has, consequently, no business to be made disagreeable. Nobody is under any obligation to read any other man's book." His own book sets some familiar characters in a new light, and can hardly fail to be read with pleasure.

Princess Christian has admirably translated an autobiography which, after being long valued by historical students, will now, in an English dress, fascinate a much larger circle. Princess Wilhelmine,† the subject of these memoirs, was born in 1709, three years before the birth of her brother, Frederic the Great. She was the daughter of that King of whom Macaulay wrote, "His palace was hell, and he the most execrable of fiends, — a cross between Moloch and Puck." The story of the youthful years of the boy and girl subjected to all the misery which paternal tyranny and brutality could inflict is a touching one. The married life of the Princess with its domestic strife, the meddling of relatives, the cooling of affection, the pinch of poverty, is no less interesting. It is almost superfluous to say that political thinkers will find much in the Princess's memoirs to attract them.

In *Carlyle's Reminiscences*‡ Mr. Norton attempts to correct Mr. Froude, and aims at setting the philosopher and his domestic relations in a more favorable light ; he wishes to do justice to the deceased, by presenting his autobiography in a form more accordant with the writer's real intentions. The point at issue between the two editors is mainly one of the correct interpretation of a dead man's wishes. For the rest, the matter is one of literary taste and good workmanship. No doubt Mr. Norton does well in replacing Carlyle's capitals, italics, punctuation, and quotation marks. He thus secures delicate shades of meaning which may easily be lost by a too free handling of such mechanism. But was it worth while to publish another edition for this, or for the purpose of *leaving out* certain passages when once they were published, although Mr. Froude may have had no right to

* *Obiter Dicta*. Second Series. By Augustine Birrell. New York : Charles Scribner's Sons.

† *Memoirs of Wilhelmine, Margravine of Bareuth*. Translated and edited by her Royal Highness Princess CHRISTIAN of Schleswig-Holstein. London : David Stott. New York : Baum & Geddes.

‡ *Carlyle's Reminiscences*. By C. E. NORTON. 2 vols. London and York : Macmillan & Co.

insert them? Carlyle is by this time thoroughly understood, both in his strength and his weakness.

Herr Koch was court chaplain from 1879, when Prince Alexander of Battenberg ascended the throne of Bulgaria, until Russian intrigue brought about the abdication of the Prince.* Our hearty thanks are due to the chaplain and to his able translators for giving us an insight into the character of a man whose virtues would do credit to any private station, but who was no less distinguished in the council chamber than on the hard-fought field of battle. Readers will rise from the perusal of his volume on *Prince Alexander of Battenberg* with increased admiration for the Prince, sympathy for his little kingdom, and detestation of the mingled wiliness and brutal violence which kidnapped a patriot and cut short a promising career.

History.

Colonel Butler's well-written history † of the gallant, though unsuccessful, attempt to relieve Khartoum and liberate its heroic defender will, no doubt, be widely read by soldiers and civilians alike. The author's knowledge is full and intimate. He tells, as only one familiar with all the details could, of government caution and needless official delay, of fierce and persistent criticism, of the final dispatch of the boats, of the victory of Abu Klea, and how the dread news arrived a few days later that noble Gordon was no more. Lady Butler's excellent illustrations add much to the value of the book.

Another book, originally intended for the same series but withdrawn owing to differences of opinion between the author and Dr. Freeman, is Mr. George Saintsbury's *Manchester*.‡ The history of the great cotton emporium from the time when it was a British settlement and the scene of a Roman camp is traced by the author's skilful pen until, in the Middle Ages, it became a place of growing commercial importance, and thence onwards up to the days of the spinning jenny, the making of the Bridgewater Canal, and the Anti-Corn Law League. No doubt many Americans will be glad to learn more about Cottonopolis.

Athos, the Mountain of the Monks,§ is a volume of exceptional in-

* *Prince Alexander of Battenberg. Reminiscences of his Reign in Bulgaria, from Authentic Sources.* By A. KOCH. London : Whittaker & Co. New York : Baum & Geddes.

† *The Campaign of the Cataracts.* By Colonel Sir W. F. BUTLER, K. C. B. Illustrated by Lady Butler. London : Sampson Low & Co. New York : Baum & Geddes.

‡ *Manchester.* By GEORGE SAINTSBURY. London : Longmans. New York : Baum & Geddes.

§ *Athos, the Mountain of the Monks.* With numerous Illustrations. By A. RILEY, M. A., F. R. G. S. London and New York : Longmans, Green & Co.

terest to the student of history, and to all Christian people who work and pray for the healing of our unhappy divisions. It may be only a pious belief of the Eastern Church that to Constantine is due the honor of the first foundation at Athos; but however this may be, it is certain that hermits were established there a thousand years ago, and the Holy Mountain, with its twenty religious houses which own the whole of the peninsula, has long been the centre of Eastern monasticism. The author and his friend, having provided themselves with a letter of commendation from the Bishop of Lichfield to the Patriarch at Phanar, and having thus obtained an influential introduction to the monks, were cordially received, and had every facility for accurate observation afforded them. The book is one we can heartily recommend.

The romantic story of *The Moors in Spain*,* how they got there, with what wisdom and tolerance they treated the conquered inhabitants, what triumphs in civilisation as well as in arms were theirs, how they raised magnificent buildings which for delicate workmanship are still the admiration of the world, and distinguished themselves in science, literature, and art, and how, finally, with marvellously short-sighted policy, and to the lasting injury of Spain, they were expelled from the land to which they had contributed so much material good,—all this is told by Mr. Poole in a way to attract and fascinate the reader. The book is now in the second edition.

Another Jubilee book is Mr. Mackenzie's history of *The Nineteenth Century: a History of the Times of Queen Victoria*,† etc., which has now reached the tenth edition, and contains many details embodying the most recent information. It is distinguished from its numerous rivals by giving, in some 470 pages, a succinct and clear account of the progress of events, not only at home but in the principal nations of Europe and also in the United States.

In the Sixth Series of her *Cameos from English History*, Miss Yonge brings before us *Forty Years of Stewart Rule*.‡ This exciting period is well represented in the thirty-one Cameos which the volume comprises. We do not feel quite sure why these chapters should be called Cameos. A cameo is certainly a work of art—but it is a work of art in which a certain effect is produced out of a certain difficult substance, and generally only one figure or group of figures is carved with color, finish, and completeness, limited by the size and tint of the

* *The Moors in Spain*. Second Edition. (*Story of the Nations*.) By S. L. POOLE, B. A., M. R. A. S. London: T. Fisher Unwin. New York: Putnam's Sons.

† *The Nineteenth Century: a History of the Times of Queen Victoria*. London and New York: T. Nelson & Sons.

‡ *Cameos from English History*. Forty Years of Stewart Rule. By the author of *The Heir of Redclyffe*. Sixth Series. London and New York: Macmillan & Co. 1887.

material. In Miss Yonge's work there is no attempt at highly burnished or picturesque description ; her chapters are not even so chosen as to admit of dramatic point and situation. There is scarcely the finish of a cameo about them ; not even the finish in language. In one place, for instance, we find the word "considerable" repeated three times in eight lines, and concerning the assassination of the lovable but weak Henry V of France, she writes that his subjects must have prayed that he might "find forgiveness for the sins not yet, alas, discarded *nor repented*." This latter may, however, be credited to the printer, perhaps. All the principal events of the time are illustrated with anecdotal detail, and dealt with by a liberal and sympathetic criticism. We have the career of Richelieu, the battle of Lutzen, the Huguenots, the siege of Rochelle, and Wallenstein, in cameos which take us far from the court and people of England. We find the authoress where we expected to find her on the subject of Laud, but she is not blind to the faults of Charles I. We await with interest her treatment of the Rebellion, for the last chapter of the present series reaches no farther than to the flight of Queen Henrietta to Holland, and the futile negotiations between the King and the Parliamentary Commissioners in 1642.

Pleasant enough reading is found in this book of Miss Yonge, just as in the history of Herodotus with its string of stories and episodes. The episodical method of writing history is, however, superior to that which is merely biographical. We say *merely* biographical, for a biography may be so written as to indicate the operation of great causes and principles in the progress of history. It is true that English and European history, as taught to us in our boyhood, was largely biographical. Such was the case also with ancient history. The events of a reign were subservient to the personal history of the ruler ; victories increased his power and defeats abridged it. But there is a method of history superior either to the biographical or the episodical method. In the series of historical works which are being reprinted in this country by Messrs. Charles Scribner's Sons, modern history is divided into epochs, each of which is distinguished by some dominating idea or principle which gives the character to the time. Thus, in that volume of Professor Morris's *Epochs of Modern History* which treats of *The Early Tudors** is traced the operation in England of the monarchical despotism which prevailed under the Welsh dynasty. This treatment of history is broad and philosophical and calculated to bring the ripest lessons of history to bear upon the education of the student. The design of this series is consequently enlightened and scientific, and the authors of each volume, being picked men, are well

* *Epochs of Modern History.* The Early Tudors. By REV. C. E. MOBERLY, M. A., late a Master in Rugby School. New York : Charles Scribner's Sons.

able to carry out the plan of their editor. Maps and indices add to the value of these works, which indeed have already been adopted as text-books in many of the principal colleges and schools in our country.

Travel.

The author of *Three Years of a Wanderer's Life** has seen much of the world East and West, from China to New York, and knows from personal experience what it is to live the seaman's life, to study medicine at Edinburgh, to be hard-up in London, and to work as a dock-laborer, to sub-edit a newspaper or act as war-correspondent. There are some curious revelations of the working of the relief system at Lichfield.

A young graduate of Christ Church, who inherits the name and much of the characteristic ability of one distinguished for research in Christian art and for clear perception of the sanctity of natural beauty, has written a very readable account of a three years' sojourn in our far-off colony of Queensland. *The New Chum in the Queensland Bush* † does not belong to the hop-skip-and-jump series in which swallow-winged travellers with "painful" diligence record their misconceptions. It is the work of a writer who has lived and worked among the people and scenes described. Mr. Tyrwhitt shirked nothing : he milked the cows, rode "Fidget," branded the cattle, split rails, helped to slaughter, took a turn at the rough work of droving, became acquainted with strange bed-fellows, whose vocabulary of vituperation was practically inexhaustible ; and he has emerged from his experiences not one whit the less a gentleman, with enlarged sympathies and strong common sense. He writes *currente calamo*, but everywhere shows the refinement of true culture. There is not a dull page in the book.

Fiction.

In fiction we have *Lord and Lady Piccadilly*,‡ in a very clever three-volume novel from the pen of the Earl of Desart. The author is a keen observer, and is as much at home with an ex-barmaid as with an editor, and with a prime minister as with Lord Piccadilly. The persons of the drama are real, the dialogues well sustained, the movement rapid, the moral, as old as the days of Solomon, excellent. "I have actually," writes Lord Piccadilly, "come upon the reason of my failure. Goodness, the only thing I never tried, is possibly the

* *Three Years of a Wanderer's Life*. By J. F. KEANE. 2 vols. London : Ward & Downey. New York : Baum & Geddes.

† *The New Chum in the Queensland Bush*. By WALTER S. S. TYRWHITT, M. A. Oxon. London : Simpkin & Co. New York : Baum & Geddes.

‡ *Lord and Lady Piccadilly*. By the EARL OF DESART. London : Swan, Sonnenschein & Co. New York : Baum & Geddes.

only thing that leads to that grand desideratum, happiness." Is the editor right when he says: "Great merit as a rule don't pay. You see, people have n't time to detect it nowadays, and it is generally wrapped up in something eccentric, which would force the readers to think, and that is what they will not do. The really good things I have published have never taken; what the public likes is trash prettily and smartly dressed." The editor and his maker, the Earl of Desart, are both somewhat pessimistic.

Jill and Jack,* in two volumes, is a work of considerable merit, though the colors are somewhat vivid and the transformation of character is too sudden to be real and permanent. Miss Wetherall's *Two North-Country Maids*† is a simple story of life in a Cumberland village which may be cordially recommended. There is nothing which jars upon the feelings of the reader, no straining after effect, nothing unreal. And the same may be said of Mrs. Phillimore's *All is Lost save Honor*.‡ A young Frenchman learns through the death-bed confession of his mother that the property which he had believed to be his own belongs to another. He therefore resolves to search for the rightful owner, who is at length discovered and becomes the wife of her honorable benefactor. Miss Phillimore writes excellent English.

The Thorncliffes§ may be profitably read by young people who wish to have a high ideal. Piety and its fairest fruit, self-sacrificing devotion to duty, are attractively represented in the character of Agnes Thorncliffe, who, being the eldest daughter of the Vicar of Ardernmoor, a widower, is little short of a mother to her brothers and sisters.

Princess Olga's *Radna, or The Great Conspiracy of 1881*,|| throws much light upon the condition of Russia and the causes which impede its progress in the "march" of nations. The social and political anomalies of the great troubles of Europe are worked up into a novel of considerable power.

Madame's Granddaughter,¶ a story of Provence, is likely to be a favorite. A lovely country is described with great fidelity, and Miss Peard knows how to be both pathetic and practical in the right place.

* *Jill and Jack*. By E. A. DILLWYN. London and New York: Macmillan & Co.

† *Two North-Country Maids*. By MABEL WETHERALL. London: Roper & Drowley. New York: Baum & Geddes.

‡ *All is Lost save Honor*. By CATHERINE MARY PHILLIMORE. London: Society for the Propagation of Christian Knowledge. New York: E. & J. B. Young & Co.

§ *The Thorncliffes*. By H. M. URWICK. London: Swan & Co. New York: Baum & Geddes.

|| *Radna, or The Great Conspiracy of 1881*. By PRINCESS OLGA. London: Chatto & Windus. New York: Baum & Geddes.

¶ *Madame's Granddaughter*. By F. M. PEARD. London: Hatchards & Co. New York: Baum & Geddes.

Mrs. Oliphant's high reputation will be further enhanced by her new novel *The Son of his Father*.* It is so written as to remind the reader that life is terribly real, and that domestic tragedies are far commoner than most people care to remember. At the same time the gloom is lightened by Elly's sunny nature, and Mrs. Oliphant admits "a time to laugh."

Sir Hector's Watch,† in the short space of 156 well-written pages, gives the romantic autobiography of a philanthropist who was upon equally good terms with the officials of Scotland Yard and with the leading representatives of the criminal classes.

Theology.

Archdeacon Farrar's *Life and Times of Solomon*,‡ contributed to the "Men of the Bible Series," is what might be expected from the pen of so brilliant and experienced a writer. No topic of interest has been omitted, and every available illustration has been made to do good service.

We sympathise with the author of *Dishonest Criticism*.§ He is a most unlucky man in being compelled by his principles to face so formidable a foe as Dr. Littledale, and in having to defend positions which common sense, common morality, and religious truth have long since pronounced untenable. In the two hundred pages of his book Professor Jones, with Jesuitical ingenuity, has urged every argument which can be adduced on his side. But it is doubtful whether a single person, who is not pledged to accept the authoritative teaching of Rome, will be one step nearer believing that equivocation is lawful, or that the end justifies the means, after he has read this volume than he was before reading it. Saint Paul is a safer casuist than Lignori.

The Catholic Truth Society, originally founded by the present Roman Catholic Bishop of Salford in 1868, was some three or four years since started afresh. Its promoters hope that in course of time it will rival in importance the Society for Promoting Christian Knowledge and the Religious Tract Society, and that it will do for the Roman Church what these latter have done for the Anglican. Its objects, stated briefly, are to disseminate small and cheap devotional works, to teach the uneducated poor, and to spread among Protest-

* *The Son of his Father*. By MRS. OLIPHANT. London: Hurst & Blackett. New York: Baum & Geddes.

† *Sir Hector's Watch*. By C. GRANVILLE. London: John Murray. New York: Baum & Geddes.

‡ *Solomon: His Life and Times*. By the REV. F. W. FARRAR, D. D., F. R. S. London: James Nisbet & Co. New York: Baum & Geddes.

§ *Dishonest Criticism. An Answer to Dr. R. F. Littledale*. By JAMES JONES, S. J. London: Hodges.

ants information about Roman Catholic belief. The decree of Dec. 29, 1886, for the Beatification of John Fisher, Thomas More, and fifty two other adherents of the Roman Faith who were put to death in England between the years 1535 and 1583 was a noteworthy event in the history of the country. Among recent publications received from the Society is a small book containing some account of the sufferings of these martyrs, so late promoted to honor. There are also some interesting tales, and two valuable tracts, one on Faith and Reason, another on Modern Socialists in their relation to the Church. Here we are on neutral ground and heartily wish an enemy God-speed. The same may be said of a more elaborate production in the form of a dialogue on *The Existence of God*. The author, Mr. Richard F. Clarke, S. I., formerly fellow and tutor of S. John's College, Oxford, writes with the grace and force of a cultured scholar. The dialogue is spirited, the statement clear, and we are led along as softly and pleasantly in the search for truth as the reader of Hume's famous dialogue is in pursuit of error. All the chief arguments — those from consciousness, design, causation, conscience, general consent — are discussed and duly estimated with a reasonableness worthy of all praise. We wish we could say as much of the description of hell torments. Such realism as we have here can be warranted only by experience or the precise word of revelation. We think, too, that the author's intelligent appreciation of modern light might well have been combined with a more sincere respect and gratitude for old arguments.

For the ordinary fairly educated members of the Church, *Before the Throne** will be found a very helpful volume of private devotions. Provision is made for those who come frequently to the Holy Communion, but who are none the less anxious to prepare themselves carefully for that sacrament. There is a service of a definite nature for spiritual communion, with suggestions for meditations, and an arrangement of subjects for Intercession not often found in such manuals.

Viewing the Holy Eucharist as the Sacrament of Peace, Miss Granger has adopted that title for an attractive little book which is a sequel to her *Light after Darkness*.† Canon Body has furnished a preface to it, and many will be glad to share in the devout aspirations which the authoress has so beautifully expressed.

We have before us, also, another little volume, "selected from the unpublished sermons and addresses of Charles Kingsley,"‡ by the

* *Before the Throne*. Written and compiled by WILLIAM BELLAVS, M. A. London : Swan, Sonnenschein & Co. New York : Baum & Geddes.

† *Peace: a Thanksgiving after Holy Communion*. By MARY ETHEL GRANGER. London : Sonnenschein & Co. New York : Baum & Geddes.

‡ *True Words for Brave Men*. By CHARLES KINGSLEY, late Rector of Eversley,

request of a Colonel of Artillery, and with the sanction of an army chaplain of long experience, who knew the influence of his writings on soldiers, and who wish that influence may live though he is no longer here."

Such a selection would naturally be made, to a considerable extent, from addresses spoken to soldiers, or in behalf of soldiers. There are, however, a number of selections that are of general application, while the sermons addressed to soldiers are of a character to interest and edify those of all occupations.

One of the most frequent features of Kingsley's sermons is the realisation of the constant presence of God, and the unceasing setting forth of the providential care and guidance of God in all the affairs and conditions of life. These sermons are full of plain, simple truths, inculcating the necessity of love to God and men, and of a firm trust in the Divine mercy through CHRIST, and a certain confidence in the fulfilment of God's promises. These features render them admirably adapted for the use of lay readers in missionary fields.

The thanks of all who see with sadness so many "drifting out of the light of faith" are due to Canon Paget for his *Faculties and Difficulties for Belief and Disbelief*.* The volume, consisting of nineteen sermons mostly delivered in the University Church, Oxford, and in the Chapel Royal, Whitehall, falls into two parts. In the former the Professor addresses the unfortunately large class of persons whose position is not so much that of disbelief as of unbelief, and he reminds them that "there must always be a certain congeniality, a sense of relation and correspondence, between ourselves and the facts that are proposed for our acceptance." In the latter part the author deals with the difficulties of disbelief, and draws attention to the fact that "it is not enough to be brilliant in negative criticism," but that disbelief as well as faith must be an apologist. There is a gentleness, beauty, and felicity of illustration in these sermons which must commend them to general readers.

The Dean of Worcester, who, as Vicar of Leeds, has a wide field for the exercise of his abilities, has in a book which it is impossible to praise too highly given us the best fruits of his experience.† This little volume is condensed wisdom. We have read it with much care, and have failed to notice a single word which the most captious reader could consider weak or foolish. Every young clergyman Chaplain to the Queen and to the Prince of Wales. New York: Thomas Whitaker.

* *Faculties and Difficulties for Belief and Disbelief*. By the Rev. FRANCIS PAGET, D. D., Canon of Christ Church, and Regius Professor of Pastoral Theology. London: Rivingtons. New York: Baum & Geddes.

† *The Parish Priest of the Town*. Lectures delivered in the Divinity School, Cambridge, by JOHN GOTTFRED, D. D., Dean of Worcester, and late Vicar of Leeds. S. P. C. K.

should get it. And it would be strange if the most experienced did not gain some practical hint, or some inspiration for more loyal devotion to a great ideal. The six lectures, delivered in the Divinity School, Cambridge, deal with the Parish Priest in his study, schools, and in society ; in his organisation ; as a preacher ; among his own sheep ; with other sheep, not of this fold — dissenters, infidels ; with his LORD, in his church, chamber, and the renewal of his vows. There are also three admirable appendices embodying the thoughts of gifted men on the training of clergy and on the specialty of our time, a list of books for private study or for lending in the parish, and excellent prayers adapted to the needs of those who labor in the vineyard.

*The Appeal to Life** is the title of a volume of fourteen sermons by a Congregational minister. For the simple reciter of Bible texts we have as little regard as the author. Nor is the dogmatist who is content with "creedal forms" entitled to much more respect. But where is there an intelligent dogmatist who does not value dogma because it is, and so far as it is, capable of regenerating society and of making man live the life of CHRIST? When, then, Dr. Munger looks "for vindication and illustration of the truth in the actual life of the world," he is doing no more than ordinary and extraordinary theologians who hold fast to their creeds, from the young curate ordained yesterday to Saint Athanasius or Dr. Pusey, have ever done. And when the author adds "that the revelation is through and in this life," he seems to confuse a revelation with its evidence and vindication. Then, again, the statement that Creation is the "path by which man gets to God, that is, the medium of the revelation of God," is, to say the least, partial and open to grave misconception. This will be enough to show that we are far from agreeing with the author on all points. Yet in justice it must be added that there is in these sermons a richness of thought and an exactness of language, an intense sympathy with suffering humanity and a profound conviction that sorrow is working out and shall be turned into joy, which must render them highly suggestive.

The second volume of Dr. Ebrard's *Apologetics*† has appeared in English, and, like its predecessor, it is an important ally on the side of scientific Orthodoxy. The reader must be prepared for patient and prolonged study if he is to master the copious minuteness characteristic of German thought. But when the enemies of Christianity take so much pains in the assault, its defenders must not grudge an

* *The Appeal to Life.* By THEODORE MUNGER. Boston and New York : Houghton, Mifflin & Co.

† *Apologetics : or, the Scientific Vindication of Christianity.* Vol. II. Clark's Foreign Theological Library. London : James Clark & Co. New York : Baum & Geddes.

equal amount of labor to secure their position. The range of *Apologetics*, "The Ethical Law and its Author," "Sin," "Redemption," "Systems opposed to Christianity," the religions of the great nations of antiquity, — these are some of the weighty matters discussed, and so illustrated that we are not reminded of the scientific paradox that excess of light makes darkness.

We commend to the study of all clergymen and laymen who have taken any interest in recent eschatological discussions, Prebendary Row's *Future Retribution*.* We have no hesitation in declaring it to be the most able, candid, and learned treatise which has as yet appeared upon a subject of transcending personal interest to all classes of believers. This subject is here handled by one of the leading divines of England, with a freshness, a fearlessness, and a judicial impartiality which is far removed either from the hazy mysticism, or the slavish traditionalism which has distinguished some treatises of recent time. The time is come when the mists and misapprehensions which have involved speculations on man's future lot should be as far as possible dispelled. All are clamoring for more light on this subject. While to the minds of many earnest and learned Christian men, Mr. Row's exposition may not be looked upon as a final disposal of the question at issue, none will deny its preëminent value as a contribution towards that most desirable consummation. The revelation of God's will and mind in Holy Scripture is a point in which all parties must come to a common starting-point, and all traditional and partisan views must be laid aside when the plain deductions of Holy Writ point to a conclusion which supersedes them. The conclusions of this volume will accordingly have either to be accepted or answered. It is a question whether they have not already been in part accepted and acknowledged by the secret consciousness of many good and thoughtful men, who still scarcely dare to avow what they would look upon as a divorce from ancient interpretation. The time, however, for cast-iron exegesis and unintelligent assent is gone or rapidly going, and, as Bishop Fuller has remarked, we must not be surprised if new discoveries are made in the written book of God, as they are constantly being made in the material book of nature.

All who, for any reason, wish to discredit the Holy Scriptures make much of the difficulties which they find or assume to exist in those sacred writings. Whether the desire arises from the wish to get rid of the moral restraint which the law of God imposes, or from intellectual pride and vanity, much injury is inflicted upon the Christian community by the religious disquiet that is caused among the simple-minded and the ignorant.

* *Future Retribution, viewed in the Light of Reason and Revelation.* By C. A. Row, M. A., Prebendary of St. Paul's Cathedral. New York: Thomas Whittaker.

The air is full of objections to the contents of our Bible, exaggerations of the difficulties which modern readers find in it, and misrepresentations of its meaning and teachings. These things are freely heard in homes and in society, in workshop, warehouse, and mill, as well as in workmen's clubs and debating societies. They are circulated in the literature provided for the working classes and the young, as well as for those who lay claim to cultured intelligence.

There is, therefore, a practical need of some plain and reasonable explanation of these passages to which objection is most frequently made, whenever such explanation can be given, though in the present state of our knowledge, historical and archæological and critical, it is not always possible to remove a difficulty. To answer these objections is the object of *A Handbook of Biblical Difficulties*, by the Rev. Robert Tuck.*

A treatise of this kind necessarily must be based upon some definite view of inspiration. The author, in his Introduction, after enumerating the "five distinct theories," as defined by Archdeacon Farrar, any one of which he thinks may be "regarded as compatible with membership in the Orthodox Christian Church," states his own position as follows : "In an eclectic spirit the following work is based upon the measure of truth there seems to be in all these theories, while jealously preserving the central truth that a special Divine fitness was given to the various writers, and a special Divine guidance directed the gathering together and preserving of these several books."

The field is a very large one, containing a multitude of varied details. For clearness of presentation the difficulties are divided into three sections or classes : 1, those relating to moral sentiments ; 2, those relating to Eastern customs and manners ; 3, those relating to the miraculous. In discussing these the author presents to his readers the results of much reading and research, and his facts and illustrations are in general drawn from the most recent publications bearing upon the subject in hand. The author never advances anything for which he does not have respectable authority, though in some points we would be inclined to differ from his conclusions, as where he makes the Cushite wife of Moses identical with Zipporah, a Midianitess. The author, however, does not claim that his solutions are in every instance necessarily the best.

It is an almost universal custom to deliver a course of Lent lectures each year in a parish church or other spiritual cure. The season and the subjects appropriate to it naturally produce a strong effect upon the minds of the religiously disposed, and lead them to the desire to

* *A Handbook of Biblical Difficulties, or Reasonable Solutions of Perplexing Things in Sacred Scriptures.* By the Rev. ROBERT TUCK, M. A. (London). New York : Thomas Whittaker.

secure these lectures in a permanent form for more careful consideration and reflection. Every year, therefore, we find a number of such lectures published. We have before us a volume containing four courses of such lectures by Dean Vaughan,* a well-known and highly esteemed writer of discourses on subjects of practical theology.

The first of these courses unfolds the Lessons of the Cross and Passion in six discourses delivered on the evenings of the first six days of Holy Week. The subject chosen for each evening is connected with the need of watchfulness and prayer, and with the atonement and death of CHRIST, but there is little in any order or method by which they are united as the parts of one single course.

The second series of lectures is on the Words from the Cross, in which each of the seven exclamations of the Saviour upon the cross are made the basis of exhortation and meditation.

These lectures are all marked by an earnestness of feeling and a simplicity of style suitable to the solemn season for which they were written, and well adapted to quicken the religious ardor of the hearers and strengthen their determination to resist evil and their desires to follow in the footsteps of their Saviour, even though it be through a path of suffering and death to a joyful resurrection.

The book of *Daniel* has been made the subject of so much controversy, and has met with so much adverse criticism, that it has been almost universally neglected in the practical religious instruction of Christians, and yet it is so striking and unique among the Old Testament writings, in both its narrative and its prophecies, as to seize strongly upon the imagination and create a lasting impression. To remedy in part this neglect, Dr. Payne Smith, Dean of Canterbury, published a series of practical expository discourses in the *Homiletic Magazine*, which have been collected and issued in the form of a volume.†

In these expositions Dean Smith eschews all critical controversy, historical or otherwise, and confines himself to the exhibition of the moral and spiritual lesson to be inculcated. When speaking of the musical instruments mentioned in the third chapter, he draws attention to the fact that, though some have Greek names, they are not necessarily Greek instruments, and the last mentioned, translated "dulcimer," is the oriental *sephonya*.

* *Lessons of the Cross and Passion. Words from the Cross. The Reign of Sin. The Lord's Prayer.* Four courses of Lent Lectures by C. J. VAUGHAN, D. D., Dean of Llandaff and Master of the Temple. New York: Baum & Geddes.

† *Daniel I.-IV.; an Exposition of the Historical Portion of the Writings of the Prophet Daniel.* By the Very Rev. R. PAYNE SMITH, D. D., Dean of Canterbury. New York: E. P. Dutton & Co.

General Literature.

The gambling spirit is, perhaps, too much part and parcel of our nature to be ever eradicated. And, at the same time, every one knows that, judiciously trained, this instinct is of great value in the pursuit of things material and spiritual. It must be trained, however, and for this purpose Mr. Proctor's *Chance and Luck** will be found useful. All gambling, in the ordinary sense of the term, he condemns, whether at public tables, in lotteries, on the race-course, or on the stock exchange. Luck is mathematically proved to be law, and to play long enough is shown to be ruin, or at best only to be as you were. Some curious coincidences are explained, and some very old fallacies exposed.

Letters from a Mourning City† is a book to be most cordially recommended. Profound melancholy and quaint humor, keen criticism and touching pathos, philosophy and sober fact, are so sweetly blended that the book is unique. The author, a medical man, stirred by the news of the terrible outbreak of cholera at Naples, determined to devote himself to the service of the poor sufferers. These letters, written by him from the scene of his arduous labors, first appeared in the Stockholm *Dagblad*; the proceeds were given to such objects of charity as the author discovered. And many they were. The misery and degradation here pictured almost baffle description, and some of the incidents related are heartrending. Has anything more affecting than the last chapter ever been written? The heroic sister Philomene will live long in the reader's memory. Mr. White has succeeded in turning Swedish into graceful and charming English.

The reputation of the late Edwin Percy Whipple as a critical essayist will at once command for his *American Literature*‡ the large number of cultivated readers which it richly deserves. The paper on Daniel Webster is in every way remarkable for its penetration, eloquence, and stimulating power; and critical acumen and refinement distinguish the whole of the volume. If not the most minute and exhaustive treatise on American Literature, it is undoubtedly the best. In a short notice of this kind we can only thus briefly sum up our impressions after a delighted perusal of its pages. The book is introduced by a preface from the pen of the poet Whittier.

* *Chance and Luck: A Discussion of the Laws of Luck, Coincidences, Wagers, Lotteries, and the Fallacies of Gambling, and Notes of Poker and Martingales.* By R. A. PROCTOR. London and New York: Longmans, Green & Co.

† *Letters from a Mourning City* (Naples, Autumn, 1884). By AXEL MUNTHE. Translated from the Swedish by MAUDE VALÉRIE WHITE. London: John Murray. New York: Baum & Geddes.

‡ *American Literature and other papers* by EDWIN PERCY WHIPPLE. Boston: Ticknor & Co.